CONTENTS

VOLUME [illegible]

THE [illegible] ... [illegible]
Walter Appleton ... 45 Eugene Wilson

THE ROUTE OF [illegible] ... [illegible]
Wilson ... Barbara Bentley

MILLS, THE [illegible] ... [illegible]
Cline ... Delaware

NOTES AND [illegible]

BOOK REVIEWS

Hay, The [illegible] ... Contributors ... [illegible]
of the [illegible]
Mills, [illegible]
part of the [illegible]

CONTRIBUTORS

INDEX

MID-AMERICA

*An Historical Review*

OCTOBER, 1939

VOLUME 21 NEW SERIES, VOLUME 10 NUMBER 4

# The Legal Crisis in the Jesuit Missions of Hispanic America

The April number of MID-AMERICA carried a treatment of the mission crisis in its connection with the international policy of the crown of Spain. Royal suspicion of foreigners prevented non-Spanish missionaries from filling the vacancies in colonial institutions. The Spanish supply was proving itself insufficient to meet the multiplying needs in the constantly broadening sphere of mission activity. A critical point was reached in the 1640's when the authorities of the Society of Jesus thought seriously of abandoning this work in the Hispanic possessions. Their urgent requests finally won from the crown permission for non-Spaniards to cross the oceans and enter the American and Asiatic sectors. The date of this concession is 1664, the year that marks the beginning of the great wave of German and Italian recruits, who left so deep an impression on subsequent mission history and on colonial development.

The crisis, however, had been something more than governmental disfavor toward aliens. Within the colonal orbit a set of circumstances had arisen, and their maturing constituted a powerful threat to the continuance of this mission work. Not that there was an absence of generous volunteers for the American field. There is no evidence of that condition in the documents on which this study is based, namely, in the letters of the generals in Rome to the Province of New Spain from 1583 to 1659.

The difficulties came from the strain of adapting the Jesuit mode of administration to the new environment. The colonial religious scheme raised serious questions. The Jesuit management of finances, and the contrast in their ranks between the creoles and the Europeans, brought trials and necessitated careful readjustment. The newcomers from a settled old country, steeped in tradition and conscious of their superiority in those

conservative qualities that make for permanence, found in the colonials a remarkable energy and enthusiasm, a readiness to open up fresh lines of work and to exploit untried opportunities, and mixed with this adventurous spirit a certain amount of callow Americanism. The resultant stress called for much patience in governing before a working harmony would unite the minds and purposes of these dissimilar parties.

The liveliest administrative worry in this period was the matter of episcopal jurisdiction over missionary districts. Jesuits had come to America prepared for high enterprise. Their men were well trained and thoroughly disciplined in close organization. They enjoyed the special favor of the hierarchy, of the viceregal officers, and of the royal government. Officialdom furnished them with a set of exemptions and privileges enabling them to go rapidly to work and to carry on unencumbered by exterior restraint. Their privilege amounted to a policy of unusual freedom and a frank recognition that they, as a religious order, had their own special regimen providing for effective and exemplary conduct on the part of their membership. The crown distributed work to them and expected them to make a success of it. Nor was their success questioned. Together with the Franciscans and Dominicans they made an enviable record with their missions, and during the latter sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries they gained the universal good will of the prelates whose helpers they were.

As years passed and colonial government reached the outlying sections, differences of opinion caused friction with the ordinaries. The original mission idea fixed ten years for the religious to do missionary work in a chosen sector. After that period would come the normal appointment of the secular clergy. Such was the spirit of the New Laws and the famous 1573 *cédula* of Philip II. But the theory was more simple than the practice. Actually few mission *partidos* reached civilian status within the specified time. The diocesan clergy failed to become proficient in the native languages, particularly the Otomi, the most difficult tongue. Native political management did not achieve trustworthy development. Native economy could not stand against European competition. The childish simplicity of the tribesmen made them easy prey for grasping individualists.

Then, too, there was the point of relinquishing thriving institutions which the religious considered parts and units of general fields marked off by tribes, languages, mountains, and rivers. Quite naturally, the privileged independence would come

into contact with diocesan expansion. The successfully organized *partidos* would be yielded up to the parochial clergy and the pioneers would go farther in the field. Such a move had been foreseen. In fact the character of the Jesuit order made it a 'light cavalry,' subject to instant orders, ready to go wherever needed, to relinquish any post for another more in distress. From the broad point of view of the general in Rome, the administration was always prepared to make such changes, but the human nature of missionaries on the spot was prone to repine at quitting a cherished position. The local units saw their labors fruitful among their beloved Indians and they feared that others might not carry on the operations with equal facility.

A more severe trial arose in what the religious considered an improper extension of episcopal power, the effort to force them into diocesan organization. There were two grounds for their privileged status of working independently of viceregal and episcopal control in the missions: the internal organization of the religious order, and the external need for a well-equipped body of compactly organized men to conquer the uncivilized and un-Christianized portions of the colonies. When once these territories were sufficiently settled for the ordinary clerical forces to operate, the religious knew that their day of independent action was on the wane. The external need in that sector would pass, and with it the missionaries must go. The point, however, was to determine just when mission territory became diocesan. And the judge in this point was the man who held high control over religious regulations, El Rey, in his capacity of chief patron of all churches in Spain and in the Indies.[1]

In several cases it appears that one or other bishop tried to hurry that day. Such a situation seemed chronic to the diocese of Guadiana, the present Durango. That diocese comprised most of the northern and northwestern missions where the best Jesuit work was done. Another focal point was Puebla de los Angeles. The effects of these efforts were serious. Generally speaking, the prelates put such pressure on the missionaries that there was earnest discussion in provincial meetings on abandoning all mission work.

Now why should all this have happened? The prelates appreciated the value of the work done, and the religious respected

[1] A fine brief description of this *Patronato Real* is given in Anton Huonder, S. J., *Deutsche Jesuitenmissionäre des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts*, Herder, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1900, "Das spanisch-portugiesische Patronat," 15-20. A useful summary may be found in the present author's *Gonzalo de Tapia*, New York, 1934, "Note on the Patronato Real," 172-179.

the position of the prelates. Perhaps the tithes were a motive, for the endowments supporting mission work were exempt from these payments.[2] Possibly the best answer is that history was moving onward, that the locale of unrestricted opportunity was receding into the far north, that territory closer to the capital was organized in normal functioning wherein the episcopate were the directors of ecclesiastical work. As their field widened, so might they expect to embrace all the operations within their effective rule. And yet this need not have changed the character of the religious regimen. The religious had to keep their manner of life, but they did not have to keep their stations here and there in the organized bishoprics. It was no small matter to work out this compromise, for, aside from the native difficulty of the arrangement, various human factors contributed irritations and emotional displacements.

To begin, the colonies of Spain in the early days were forcing-beds for lawsuits. The hierarchy of jurisdiction, with its final court in the Council of the Indies, made for interminable appeals. Almost everybody of importance in New Spain was involved in cases concerning property rights and the limits of power in civic offices, and the Jesuits were no exception. Lest they waste time in these cases and alienate good will, the general was at pains to remind them to stay out of legal involvements.[3] The colonial era was one of continuous readjustments. The constant shifts of rights resulting from new *entradas* of conquest or economic or missionary penetration, explorations, the creation of new political divisions and bishoprics, all revised the original simple system into a complex fabric of life. The juxtaposition of natives and Europeans, of creoles and Peninsulars, of the secular priesthood with a multitude of orders and their particular privileges—necessary for the work but irritating to officialdom—and the pronounced penchant for litigation in the colonies of Spain, made for decades of legal action to establish and re-establish the rights of persons and corporations.

Individuals might be quarrelsome. The struggle of missionary life did not make for placidity and the calm of leisure. The change in title of productive *haciendas* could not go unfelt in a milieu where there was much fear of insolvency. The wonder is not that there was difficulty but that so much was done. From

---

[2] See, on this matter of tithes, the sober and profuse work of Andrés Pérez de Rivas, *Crónica y Historia Religiosa de la Provincia de la Compañía de Jesús de México en Nueva España*, Mexico, 1896, I, 152.

[3] See, for example, Vitelleschi to Lorenzo, May 6, 1626.

the suits and cases there resulted a smoother administrative machinery. One only element of basic risk remained, the *Patronato Real,* with its power to remove, to suppress, to withdraw support and the right to exist. This, however, is not the place to show how that power was used to destroy the missions after 1750. The present task is the tracing of the tension and the ultimate compromise in jurisdiction.

The extension of episcopal power is the nub of the story. In many places the bishops sought to bring the religious under a control proper to the secular clergy but scarcely consistent with the independence requisite for carrying on a religious order. This independence enables an order to achieve close control of its members, to supervise virtuous living and correct ministry, and to beget the special obedience to religious superiors who must necessarily have the freedom to remove men for causes that might not permit of external consultation. The conflict is often called the *doctrina* controversy because it involved what were known in Spanish law as the *doctrinas.*

A *doctrina* was, roughly speaking, a mission district. The word is also used for the systematic catechism of Christian doctrine as it was taught to the Indians. The head of a *doctrina* was a *doctrinero.* If he were a secular priest, he would be called a *cura,* a name signifying his charge and at the same time his dependence on his bishop who could both appoint and remove him, who as an agent of the crown could give him the usufruct of the *doctrina* revenues, and who had the right of regular inspection called visitation. If the *doctrinero* were a religious such as a Jesuit, he could claim no salary, and, as he was not sent by the bishop, he was not in charge of a *cura.* The *doctrina* is sometimes referred to as a *partido* or division of the mission field or of the tribe being evangelized.[4]

From the first days these *doctrinas* were maintained in territories where the heathen predominated in numbers. With no stable residence they formed only the nucleus of a settlement which had to be Christianized little by little. Spiritual jurisdiction among them did not belong to any diocese but was derived directly from the Holy See. Religious were destined to convert them according to the will of the king, to whom the pope had committed the charge of sending men fit for the preaching of the Gospel. These men penetrated into the unorganized territory

[4] This matter receives classic treatment in Pablo Hernández, S. J., *Organización Social de las Doctrinas Guaraníes en la Compañía de Jesús,* Barcelona, 1913.

with authority emanating immediately from the Holy Father to whom they were directly subject. They exercised all their necessary ministries without dependence on any diocesan ordinary but only on their religious superior, who was the channel, through his major superior, from the Holy See.

As time brought civilization and Christianity to the natives, the missionaries should ordinarily have come under the control of the bishop in the newly formed diocese. In America, however, there was a scarcity of secular clergy, and to place the regulars directly under the episcopacy would bring a double jurisdiction and tend to hamper the work of the orders and to contravene their regular character.

With this problem in mind, Philip II asked the Holy See for a dispensation from the ordinary discipline as set down by the Council of Trent and published through the Spanish dominions by the same Philip II in 1564.[5] He wished the religious to continue the administration of the *doctrinas* and of the sacraments as though they were parish priests, yet depending only on their superiors and not on the bishops. This petition was granted by Pius V in his brief *Exponi Nobis* on March 24, 1567.

Opposition to this arrangement broke out in time and the attack was so serious that it threatened to end the corporate work of the Jesuits in their missions. Other orders were not so worried. The Franciscans and Dominicans were on the scene earlier when there was no diocesan clergy, and from this fact it followed that members of these orders were appointed prelates. The effect was a fusion, and a confusion, of jurisdiction, to some extent, though at certain periods these two orders suffered similar missionary ordeals in company with their later co-workers.

By a queer coincidence, the first troubles of the Jesuits had their origins in the urging of viceroys and bishops that the religious take away from them some of their own prerogatives. The first occurrence is in Peru, where the renowned viceroy Francisco de Toledo demanded that the Jesuits accept two diocesan parishes or *curas* with all their rights and possessions and manage them independently of episcopal provision.[6]

---

[5] See Hernández, 324.

[6] These were Indian parishes in the dioceses of Lima and Juli. The fact is plainly stated in a letter from Luis de Velasco, II, to Philip III. Velasco had been viceroy of Peru from 1596 to 1604 and was now viceroy of Mexico. The letter is printed in Francisco Xavier Alegre, S. J., *Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en Nueva España*, Mexico, 1842, II, 104-105. On this same point see Arthur Franklin Zimmerman, *Francisco de Toledo, Fifth Viceroy of Peru*, Caldwell, 1938, 174.

A concrete example of this whole subject is the story of the *doctrina* of Tepotzotlán which appears in many letters of the *Colección de cartas inéditas de los Padres Generales.*[7] Tepotzotlán was the center of a small group of Indians about twenty-five miles north by northwest of Mexico City. In 1581 the Archbishop of Mexico, Pedro Moya de Contreras, asked the Jesuits to send some men there. The previous curates had not known the native languages, Otomi, Masaguan, and Mexican, said to be the most difficult tongues in the viceroyalty. Due to the death of the incumbent, the *doctrina* was unprovided with its *cura.*

The Jesuits were just beginning to attack the missionary problem, and their Father Visitor, Juan de la Plaza, requested the archbishop to find them a place where they could both aid the natives and learn their speech.[8] His petition coincided with that of Moya and early in 1581 the Jesuits arrived. Quickly the scattered natives were "reduced" into one pueblo. Alegre tells us that their coming voluntarily and without the use of force was an altogether new thing in New Spain. The conversion of a very "bad" Indian caused it all. Families of other linguistic stock joined the *población.* Instructed and baptized, they soon became exemplary Christians. The archbishop had offered to turn over the regular stipend proper to a *cura,* but the fathers refused to take title to the ordinary revenues and they distributed the surplus of several rich *haciendas* to the natives for the construction of a civilized community.

In the very next year the provincial tried to recall his men from Tepotzotlán because the general, Claude Aquaviva, refused to allow them to become *curas* in the canonical sense. Accepting "presentation" from the archbishop would make the Jesuits subject to the will and appointment of the prelates in the future. Aquaviva felt that such a concession would cut into the religious regimen; it would give his men two superiors with equal authority; it would hamper the provincial power to make readjustments; it would dissipate the "light cavalry" character of the order, both in settling men in fixed positions and in dividing the command.

The Indians heard of this intention and sent delegates to see the archbishop. Alegre copies out their petition.[9] They asked for a compromise arrangement. The upshot was the appointment of

---

[7] For a short description of this *Colección* see MID-AMERICA, April, 1939, 98, Note 1. These letters form the basis of the present study.

[8] See Alegre, I, 162-171; also Rivas, II, 164.

[9] I, 187.

a secular *beneficiado* as the canonical pastor with all his perquisites and responsibilities. To the Jesuits were given the residence and garden which they had been occupying there. They were to live in Tepotzotlán and assist the *beneficiado*. This appointee was a man who got along well with the fathers and the combination worked in harmony for many years. In 1584 the Jesuits opened the Seminario de San Martín as a school for native boys. Two years later the novitiate was moved to Tepotzotlán, and in 1604 a college was founded there. In this institution the Indians came to such remarkable intellectual development that some of their number later on, as priests and religious, became professors of their language and even of so difficult a science as canon law.

In those days men were bold, striking out daringly to build new patterns of life. A later age would point out the folly of expecting consistent unity between the *beneficiado* and his helpers. The fact is that for twenty-two years there was peace between them, until in 1608 we find the *cura* going to Mexico with a set of complaints and a request for an appointment elsewhere. The fathers also had their story of the differences. It finally appeared that a new arrangement was imperative. The *curas* had not learned to speak in Otomi and the seminary and college had won the affection of the natives. The archbishop accordingly asked the viceroy to realign the situation.

The viceroy, Luis de Velasco II, wrote to His Majesty in 1610. The long letter is given in full in Alegre.[10] He said that His Majesty had asked for a report on the *doctrina* of Tepotzotlán. It seemed that, for the discharge of the royal conscience and the good of the Indians in that *partido,* it would be better to give the *doctrina* entirely to the Jesuits. They had done well there as helpers of the secular clergy. However, they did not wish to accept the post as a *cura*. Never had they accepted *doctrinas* in the Indies except the two which Viceroy Francisco forced them to take in Peru, those in Lima and Juli. Disturbance had arisen in Tepotzotlán from the overt acts of the clerics there, who, it was thought, should not be sent back. The Jesuits, on the other hand, had a seminary there for boys, a novitiate, and a college. Velasco's thirty-five years' acquaintance with them in the Indies convinced him that they did not want *doctrinas* for any selfish aims. Everywhere they acted as helpful

[10] II, 103-105. The letter has several references to Peruvian affairs. The reply of the king is likewise given in this place.

associates of the diocesan clergy. The Indians there were very devoted to the fathers. The father general had lately granted, with much difficulty, permission for his men to try out the plan of acting as *doctrineros* in this one pueblo. It would be a great benefit to the natives there. His Majesty should concede this grace to the fathers and give them that *doctrina*.

In 1618 all hearings on the case were finished, and Philip III sent a *cédula* to the viceroy, now the Marqués de Guadalcazar. The incumbent *cura* was to be promoted to the cathedral of Mexico, and the king proceeded:

> You know well, from our law and the apostolic bulls, as well as from my right as King of Castile and Leon, that to me pertains the presentation of all the dignities, canonries, appointments and ecclesiastical benefices, both here in Spain and in the Indies, and in the islands and lands of the Ocean Sea. It is likewise mine to provide for the *doctrinas* of those realms, to unite or divide benefices for those of my vassals who have learning, conscience and a good life. And now as I watch over that right and patronage, I give order that . . . you hand over the said benefice to the said Company of Jesus. Done in Madrid, June 5, 1618.
>
> The King.

Aquaviva had given his consent in 1609. In reply to a petition addressed to him by the Seventh Provincial Congregation of the Province of New Spain, he wrote:

> *Petition:* That you grant that our men be allowed to act as parish priests wherever they live, both in the Tepotzotlán College and in the others.
> *Response:* By no means does it seem proper to concede this faculty, for it is opposed to our Constitutions, and experience has taught us that the thing does not work out. Meanwhile let trial be made of it in that one college. Time will show what final decision we ought to take in this matter.

Indeed time would show. At the moment the provincial made a summary note at the end of the document, thus showing his interpretation of the response. He wrote: "Our men are not to take the office of *curas* in other colleges but only in Tepotzotlán."[11] From the context this concession for Tepotzotlán appears to have been made before the larger petition was sent to Rome, very likely in the same year.

Year by year brought an increasing number of royal *cédulas*

---

[11] Aquaviva to Mexican Province, Rome, June 30, 1609. This letter and the following letters of the generals are found in the *Colección*.

with further regulations and restrictions. That of 1637 was particularly disturbing. All religious who now exercised the office of *cura* in a *doctrina,* or would do so in future, must submit to an examination in doctrine and language. Likewise they must conform to episcopal provision, collation, canonical institution, visitation, correction, and removal at the will of the ordinary.[12]

The ruling viceroy sent back to Madrid such a eulogy of the Jesuit work at Tepotzotlán that the authorities suspended action on the *cédula* and left them in peaceful possession of the *doctrina.* Not till 1652 did the question come up again. In that year a definitive *cédula* required all religious to conform to the fullest royal regulation under the *Patronato.*[13] The *doctrina* was given up in the following year. The decision is part of the larger story on which we must now embark.

The history of the Tepotzotlán *doctrina,* its opening in 1581, the agreement of 1618, and the document of 1653, exemplify the general trend of the adjustment in religious jurisdiction throughout Hispanic America. A document of 1640 will show a larger part of the picture. It is headed: Reply of our Father General Mutius Vitelleschi to a memorial which Father Pedro de Velasco, Procurator of the Province of Mexico, presented to him on the subject of *doctrinas,* on April 6, 1640. The memorial follows, and below it is the reply:

*Petition:* The religious of the Company of Jesus in the Province of New Spain, subjects of Your Paternity, in obedience to the laws of their institute and their duties to their lords the Catholic Kings of Spain, have been and are employed in the conversion and instruction of the barbarian Indians of this province, especially the missions of Nueva Vizcaya. There, eleven of our Company have shed their blood at the hands of the barbarians for Christ. They have entered into the Province of Cinaloa, once all pagan, and they have gained more than 200,000 souls. They have brought more than 130 leagues of that country under the obedience of the Church and of the Catholic King. They have founded pueblos and churches which they now administer, and they visit other more remote provinces of gentiles. There are no other clerics or religious of any other order in their district.

The Company is excused from accepting *doctrinas* of Indians in the now pacified districts which are administered by clerics and other religious. They hold only one of this kind, the *doctrina* in the pueblo of Tepotzotlán in the archbishopric of Mexico. This *doctrina*

[12] The account of this *cédula* is in Alegre, II, 226-227.

[13] This *cédula* is referred to in several letters given below. Alegre gives it lengthy treatment in his *Historia,* II, 384-389, 401-402.

those of the Company have cared for during the past thirty years, for just and reasonable causes, since the King Our Lord Philip III entrusted it to them, and another rather small one in San Luis de la Paz, of the bishopric of Michoacán. This one the Viceroy entrusted to them in order to further the pacification of the Chichimecos Indians, a project which had involved grave damage and very high expenditure of the royal funds. Once these Indians had come willingly into the *doctrina,* these burdens of government were lifted.

It is well known that the religious of the Company have attended with all diligence and good example to the teaching and instructing of these natives and to the conversion of the gentiles, with many happy results and the discharge of the duty of the royal conscience, —a charge that belongs to the King as he is Patron of this conversion and the *doctrinas* of these natives.

Now we have received intimation of a *cédula* of His Majesty, sent in common to all the religious who administer *doctrinas* in New Spain. He desires complete obedience to the ordinances of His Majesty, basing his claim on the debt owed him by our whole Society and especially by this province, and most of all on the great harm that would follow if we abandoned these *doctrinas* where we are actually supported by the royal funds and liberality.

Under our care is a great number of souls. Their disposition is inconstant. Politically speaking, the peace of this barbarous and militant race is highly desirable, while their disturbance would cause serious and perhaps irreparable consequences. The pacification of the Tepeguan nation alone, who form but a tenth part of the Indians under our charge, has cost 900,000 pesos to the royal treasury.

Wherefore, seeing that this Province of New Spain cannot on its own decision subject itself to the demands of the new *cédula,* disagreeing as it does with our institute and manner of life—and noting that before this *cédula* came we hindered no one but our help was acknowledged gratefully, and we served God Our Lord and His Holy Church, and His Catholic Majesty and the good of souls in these realms—therefore, as the institute which our order professes places the decision in this matter with Your Paternity as our general and head, we ask Your Paternity to give instructions for our conduct in this situation.

*Response:* I praise and congratulate your province for its affection and devotedness in obeying with all punctuality the orders of His Majesty and the Royal Council of the Indies, as far as our institute can allow. You know I have charged you to do this, for the important obligations which our Company recognizes. In particular your province has done well in sending its petition dutifully to me, in good form, and leaving for me the resolution of the present case in which your province is unable to decide, for such determinations depend on the general.

Now I know the singular zeal of His Majesty and the Royal Council. I am sure, too, that they admire the training, doctrine and exhortation of the Indians, and the sufficiency and good example of those who are their teachers and pastors. Trusting in this piety and Christian spirit of His Majesty I know he will listen kindly when he is informed of all these matters (as I order the Father Procurator to inform him, in the name of the Company and of myself). He will find that his policies will obtain greater advantage and blessing if he keeps the Company in the regime in which it has exercised its ministry for so many years to the glory and service of the Divine and Human Majesties and the increasing profit of so innumerable a conversion of gentiles.

As to our style of government, particularly instituted and distinct from that which others employ, I shall ask His Majesty to deign with His Royal Clemency to retain his esteem for the manner of our past work among the Indians. I shall represent with proper submission that in whatever does not contravene our institute, as in our men being examined in doctrine and language facility by whatever persons are named, he will see us agreeing to his wishes with all promptness and joy. I shall ask that he prevent only what subverts our constitution.

I feel certain that when His Majesty and the Royal Council are informed on this point, the Company will receive new favor and encouragement in its manner of life, its rules and governance. He will recall that in our enterprises among the Indian missions we find no utility nor any human interest save the service of Our Lord and of His Majesty. This is a grand reward, even though it cost us much suffering, labor, hardship, and not a few lives—either taken by the hands of the infidel or hurried to their term by the labor and hard environment. There will be no lack of devotion and obedience to His Majesty, which may the Divine Grace guard. Rome, April 6, 1640. Mutius Vitelleschi.

Therein the reader may see that a critical point has been reached. The very length and diffuseness of the letter testify to the worry felt by the order in Mexico. The authorities wished to force the Jesuits to accept *doctrinas* in the pacified districts and thus to place themselves directly under the bishops. Should the order find it impossible to accept this arrangement, great harm loomed for the Indian system. King, Council, viceroy, and episcopate would feel that their previous liberality was now ungenerously forgotten in the readiness to abandon the missions on account of the regulatory acts which the authorities deemed imperative. On the other hand, the general could not see how to give in completely without dissolving the constitutional principles of his order.

The letters printed below will exhibit the development of this difficulty. It is plain that individual thoughtlessness or arbitrary official action increased the trouble, but cool-headed administrators finally worked out a solution.

An example of the wrong type of official is found in the following document. It is preserved in the *Colección* without any sign of its provenance beyond the superscription. Undoubtedly a copy, it bears the gloss *"Provincia, 1623."* It is a letter which the *fiscal* of the Council of the Indies, Diego González de Cuenca y Contreras, wrote to the viceroy of New Spain, the Conde de Pliego, on June 24, 1623. The letter is a scathing criticism of the viceroy for interfering in the *doctrina* régime. He is told that modifications of this system do not belong to him but to the king. The section dealing explicitly with the *doctrinas* is here given:

Now there is this matter of the *doctrinas* of the religious. Assuredly this is the most serious question in the Indies, and one wherein Your Excellency should exercise the greatest caution. For it concerns the supremacy of His Majesty, the good of the Indians, and what is more, the security of your own conscience.

Now many complaints deserving of consideration have come from persons worthy of credit. They say that, under your orders and a pretense of religion, the Indians are being treated in a way that does them great injury and vitiates the principal aim of their *doctrina* and instruction.

Some of your *doctrinero* appointees do not know the language needed for their teaching work. Others use their positions as a step on which to rise to higher ambition. What is worse, these men have boldly made Your Excellency agree with them that if they are removed the public peace will be disturbed and the commonwealth collapse. Now this manner of thought and speech deserves a chastisement that will be an example.

There are cases of similar influence on you. There are also official decisions wherein, with no hesitation over the irregularity of the acts, you have embraced the friars and clerics alike [under your control]. No one during the reign of Your Excellency should dare such things, for it is no less than to say that the King is not the King. It comes to this that the right of the friars is abrogated.

Now the first principle of governing is to agree with the royal authority and obedience, and to recognize your place of service, and to do His will.

Some members of the Council of the Indies have been suffering various indispositions, and hence they have come to no decision on the claim of the ordinaries to visit religious curacies. That decision will come shortly.

One of the weaknesses of your rule, for which they blame Your Excellency, is that you have no prudent counselors, that you deceive those whom you have and then fear them, that you make good ones simply puppets, that you tell them that with no other advice or on your own personal consideration you would have taken better decisions. Let Your Excellency see to this at once, and let the future take care of itself. This bit of advice will not hamper your work. Do not take it amiss, but rather see the kind intention that motivates it.

For the good account of Señor Don Fernando Carillo, and his superior zeal, we are indebted. But just as the Council in its acts never fears to make changes if it sees that they are needed, so Your Excellency will not abandon hope of a reformation in the type of decision that you are obliged to make.

The letters of the generals from Rome manifested their constant concern with the problem. On October 30, 1639, Vitelleschi wrote to Pérez de Rivas, his provincial in Mexico. This letter, beginning "Muy bueno compañero," continues:

There is a novel plan broached in your territory against the religious on the matter of *doctrinas*. For several years they have tried to make it the established system in Peru. If they have not already put it in force—at least in the case of our men—, you ought to use all possible influence within the limits of religious propriety and modesty to prevent us from being obligated to what they demand.

On the case which you submit to me, in reference to your own province, this is my reply, as I have on different occasions had to write it to Peru: on the point of subjecting ourselves to examination in doctrine and language, in as far as this will please the bishops and viceroys, we shall accept it gladly. But in no case can we do so when we have to present our men for each *doctrina* in order that the Bishops select their own choice, one whom the superior cannot remove without giving his side of the case as though they were benefices granted [in the canonical sense], and where they might *visit* them as though they were secular curates, in point of conduct and manner of life. It is not just that we cede in matters so damaging to religious government. Such *doctrinas* would subject the Company to intolerable pressure.

If Your Reverence can make a generous arrangement in this way, without doubt it will be the only proper solution, as the fathers in Peru have settled it. If the authorities insist, then Your Reverence, after hearing your consultors and other fathers working among the Indians, will inform me of what you judge prudent in the case so that I may then take the final decision.

The next letter touches the famed controversial subject, the old story of the Venerable Juan de Palafox, Bishop of Puebla.

The *Colección* has many hitherto unpublished documents on the case, but they would add nothing new to the history of the episode except for one thing, the severe attitude shown by the generals toward local administrators for what he considers their importunate and impulsive readiness to fight at the drop of a hat. His counsels of modesty, resignation, and silence under attack, deserve to be better known. As this is not the place to give them in full, the reader must be content to find short indications of them here and there in the letters connected with the present subject. The following is important as part of our general discussion. It is a letter of Vitelleschi to Luis de Bonifaz, provincial of Mexico. He wrote from Rome, March 30, 1644:

I read with no small compassion the story of the deposition of the Duke of Escalona from the viceregal office. I confess my dismay. It is one of the extraordinary effects which this age has brought. Truly Our Lord holds us in His Hand.

I want to discuss the sufferings which the Lord Don Juan de Palafox, Bishop of Puebla, has occasioned. They give me great concern, both in the nature of the negotiations he is undertaking and the fears they engender lest some violence ensue while he holds his power.[14] And I seriously charge Your Reverence before all else to be primarily concerned that all the men of your province speak of this prelate in a becoming manner, bearing patiently and in silence the occasions of mortification. It is best to proceed in this way, particularly in view of our part in the negotiations.

And I mention this because I have been given to understand, with no small sorrow, that our men have not so acted on previous occasions, speaking both among themselves and with seculars in an unbecoming manner. The worst part of it is that the offenders were important persons who should have given an example to the rest. It does not stop argument to say that we are modestly defending ourselves in all possible ways. Let us lay His Lordship under obligation to us, returning [severity] with generosity, overcoming evil with good. Perhaps he will change. Your Reverence should be aware of the widespread fear that if he takes the bridle he may do us much harm, not alone in material matters but in our credit and good name. And be alert then so that on our part we do not fail to act up to our religious profession. . . .

---

[14] Diego López Pacheco, Marquis de Villena, Duque de Escalona, was removed from office as viceroy on June 10, 1641. Under secret orders from the court Palafox took possession of the government until the new viceroy, Garcia Sarmiento de Sotomayor, should arrive. Some suspicion of disloyalty had brought about the removal of López Pacheco. It was the time of the Portuguese independence movement. The viceroy later proved his complete integrity and was rewarded with the rule of Sicily. See on this matter Alegre, II, 237.

Fourthly, I say that we may not overlook the fact that the Lord Prelate may wish to lay hands on our government and try to change it into the form which Your Reverence apprehends. This will be a sure way to destroy the [Jesuit] provinces of the Indies. May God pardon us if anyone of our men has a part in it! And if any are suspected of having entered into his plan or having given memorials about the alternative [subjecting scheme], it will be necessary for the Company to make an example of them. For it is certain that those who so directly oppose our institute are not its sons nor do they deserve to be treated as such. If Your Reverence, with the circumspection which your prudence assures, will find out who are the guilty ones and what kind of false rumors they have spread, it will be worth your efforts. If you discover any certain facts, you must advise me. Before I received the letter of Your Reverence on this matter and the paper you enclosed, I wrote to M [?] to have no ears for such tales and to take proper precautions. Your Reverence is blameless. May Our Lord not wish to chastise us so severely! At present, though, I have no fear.

On the matter of the *doctrinas* I know nothing to permit except what I have written on former occasions. On the condition of examination in doctrine and language we need make no difficulty but subject ourselves as the ordinaries desire. In other points, as in being visited on conduct and customary method, as if the benefices were granted by the bishops—wherein priests could not be moved without the consent of the ordinaries, and after presenting the causes—, and on the point of presenting three men for the choice of the ordinary, in these and similar points it is not proper for the Company to yield. Before giving up our tenure of the *doctrinas,* and subjecting ourselves to what no one believes to be conformable to our institute, —and after we have labored there for so many years and with so much success—, we shall rather have to give up the care of any missions.

I do not know why the Bishop of Guadiana aims at that novel arrangement. Besides, as Your Reverence well says, the missions of Cinaloa, strictly speaking, are neither benefices nor [canonical] *doctrinas* but reductions or missions like those of Paraguay.

It is good that you keep eight in the Parras and Tepehuanes district, because of the destruction that would otherwise come to those poor souls. Your precaution of speaking to the viceroy is very appropriate. I hope that he will find a remedy, and if not he then His Majesty.

On the matter of tithes there is nothing to do but to follow our right [of exemption] in law as they do in Madrid. Enter your suit there. The gravity of the case demands it. Father Francisco Crespe, our Procurator of the Indies, has begun the case with all earnestness, and his successor, Father Balthasar de Lagunilla, has arranged and furthered it. Rome, March 30, 1644. Mutius Vitelleschi.

A note in a letter from Carlos de Sangro, vicar *ad interim* after the death of Vitelleschi, informs the provincial of Mexico, Juan de Bueras, of the improvement in the general situation. Writing on December 30, 1645, he says:

The high respect in which the Company is held by the viceroys, the Archbishop of Mexico, and the other bishops of the viceroyalty, together with the *audiencia real,* the tribunals, the local governments and the Inquisition, is very welcome news. I refer to what that holy tribunal decided—to use four of our men in the business which it has undertaken—, a signal demonstration of high honor, as His Majesty said when I gave him the account of the ruling of the Inquisition.

The next letter of Sangro to Bueras, on the same date as the one above, shows proof of further effort to keep in harmony with the colonial administration. Mention is made of some mines on a *hacienda* connected with one of the missions. Pertinent extracts follow:

I approve of your method of satisfying the *Audiencia Real* of Guadalajara and its President, about the complaints registered by Father José Pascual and some others of our men. Their conduct was quite in keeping with our institute.

I highly approve your resolution to summon Father Fernando de Mellen out of the missions and to send him to the college at Guadalajara. With this act of yours I hope an end will come to managing those *minas negras,* and consequently a cessation of the many murmurings and complaints which began to arise against our missionaries. I praise your decision to forbid rigorously any of our men from being diverted to an employment so foreign to our profession.

The Company in your viceroyalty is highly favored by the Viceroy, Señor Conde de Salvatierra. I shall be glad to write the letter which he requested. Rome, December 30, 1645. Carlos de Sangro.

Just before his death, Father Francisco Piccolomini wrote of some serious problems. The vicar *ad interim,* Goswin Nickel, signed and sent it from Rome on May 20, 1651. The Palafox case was in process in Rome and the words of the general exhibit the concern he felt over the critical legal position of the order and its relations with the hierarchy.

If the intentions of the Lord Bishop of Nueva Vizcaya are those which Your Reverence outlines, then you must take care to give no cause of irritation to His Illustrious Lordship. I charge you seriously to keep from arousing any ill feeling on his part, no matter how

little he may think of us. Do not refuse to show him your faculties for confession and preaching, nor to have our men undergo the examination if the Lord Bishop wants it. On that score I praise what the men did when they were asked to show their credentials.

Regarding the contents of that Bull which the Lord Don Juan de Palafox received, we have had enough of Z I X [code term not identifyable in the *Colección* code]. I did all that I could to defend our Company with justice. You will be advised of the result.

Your Reverence wrote a sufficiently full account of the great question of abandoning or retaining the missions. [Three lines obliterated here.] Still there is the situation, and nothing prevents our yielding. When it is impossible to avoid every change, it is prudent not to refuse to give in on small matters such as we find in making arrangements for our missions. Consider the whole problem with your consultors and other experienced and zealous men, and write me your answer.

In the following letter Nickel expresses his disappointment over the outcome of the Palafox case,[15] and prays that in the future the Company may be free from such litigation, *"ut sine timore serviamus illi in sanctitate et justitia."* He continues to the subject of the *doctrinas*:

The memorial which Your Reverence entrusted to Father Diego de Salazar on the missions has not yet come to me. If the conditions requisite for continuing them are impossible, as Your Reverence says, it will not be difficult to take an immediate resolution. We shall see the memorial and study it, and then advise you what ought to be done. To P. Rada, Provincial of Mexico. Rome, June 20, 1852. Goswin Nickel.

Nickel wrote from Rome on December 12, 1652:

We have seen the information which you sent us on the affair of the Lord Bishop of Oaxaca. But as he is now deceased you ought no longer to urge that suit. God has him with Him in heaven, and there he sees the good works and alms which you offer for him.

So far we do not have the memorial which you made up, to show the propriety of my discarding some missions. That point needs much thought. We shall deal with it promptly when the memorial arrives, and then resolve what ought to be done for the greater service of Our Lord.

The same day he sent under another cover a discussion of

---

[15] For this case see Antonio Astrain, S. J., *Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en la Asistencia de España*, Madrid, 1902-1928, V, 356-412; also Alegre, II, 273-358, and Rivas, I, 148-206. Rivas was a notable contemporary of this suit.

the northern missions that were endangered by the attitude of the bishop of Durango:

I have the second letter of Father Rada, noting that the Lord Bishop of Nueva Vizcaya continues to give us what [he feels] we deserve, and that he has presented clerics to be *curas* of the missions of Tizonazo and Labotas, and that our men have entered pleas against his action. They acted with undoubted propriety.

Father Rada adds that the same bishop is making a new attempt to accomplish what he has asked for the Lord Bishops of the Indies for many years, that the religious who manage *doctrinas* should be subject to the bishops. They have put all the other religious under their control, as Father Mutius wrote in his letter of October 30, 1639. That bodes ill for us.

You have express and repeated orders from my predecessors in this whole affair, forbidding your province and the others in the Indies from subjecting yourselves to these conditions. As it is a very grave point I shall not attempt to order anything to the contrary, but I ask you to consider it seriously and see what can be done. Meantime Your Reverence must do all in your power to preserve our men in their profession, using such means as with the consent of your consultors you judge most effective. I shall advise you of my views after I have thought over it, and I shall then direct you in their execution.

An excellent sidelight on the episcopal attitude is given in another letter of the same date from Nickel to the new provincial, Francisco Calderón, who was appointed by him and took office on January 3, 1653. It reads:

I am told that the Lord Bishop of Guadiana is much offended against us because he says that our men acted as judges against His Illustrious Lordship. [The charge is] that one of our men accepted a commission as judge in a suit of the Metropolitan against the vicar of the said Lord Bishop and in favor of the governor of Nueva Vizcaya. Assuredly such cases have caused me suffering. And I should have grieved more had I known the irritation that followed, as you indicated it to me, and that in similar cases the superiors have not done their duty but have let pass like conditions without any notice, as I am informed. What kind of men are they, to put our fathers into negotiations so foreign to our profession, particularly when they know that they thus offend the prelates?

Your Reverence must see if what is here put down is true, and give a just penance to the culprits. And command our men seriously not to admit such commissions in any way nor to enter suits that do not concern us but which occasion complaints and offense to bishops and governors. In your province we have suffered much for our own faults. Do not give occasion for new troubles and disturbances.

The Jesuits in Mexico realized the growing antipathy, and they saw clearly the reasons for dislike and irritation. The following document is an excellent illustration of their vision of things and of their generous wish to remove all grounds for unfriendliness. The citation is taken from the requests that were forwarded by the provincial congregation of November 2, 1653, to the general in Rome. He in turn signified his approval with some pertinent advice in the return mail of October 9, 1655.

*Petition:* The cathedral churches here institute almost endless suits and trials in relation to the tithes they would collect from our annual revenues, particularly when any new ranches are donated to us. The fathers of the congregation held a long discussion on the point of entering some agreement with those churches. It was proposed, since we are exempt from the payment of tithes, to arrange a substitute, for example, to offer a twentieth or a thirtieth of the fruits, and this not on former holdings but on those that may come to us in the future. The congregation decided to expose their plan to the R. P. N. General, whose known prudence will dictate what we should do in this point.
*Response:* I am very happy to approve your plan for ensuring peace by striking up an agreement with the churches. I know that several colleges enjoy good revenues. For that reason I am very much inclined toward your suggestion; it will please me quite as fully as it will benefit the colleges, especially since we live in perilous times. Still, be sure to advise the General of the conditions in your agreement so that he may study them and decide whether his approval might involve any prejudice or harm to our institutions. Goswin Nickel.

In 1655 Nickel pointed out two more causes of ill feeling toward his men, and for the matter in hand they have great importance. The Council of the Indies was making its final and irrevocable decision on the permanent relation between bishops and missionaries, and that decision was certainly influenced by the very imprudent action of a certain Jesuit who came to Europe from Mexico with a box of silver that he was bringing from a layman in America to another in Spain. He attempted to enter the metal without passing through the customs. The silver was found and the case went at once to the Council. His personal penalty is not mentioned in this letter of the general, but Nickel writes that the deed "raised up a clamor and angered His Majesty and his ministers. . . . And at the instance of prudent and devoted friends I feel obliged to take effective steps lest it occur again and the Company be discredited as Your

Reverence knows it was on this occasion." He continues: "On receipt of this, Your Reverence will proclaim my order to all for their most exact observance, so that we may be far removed from those greater dangers and disasters that we now apprehend with certain ground for fear." After touching on some other points, he writes:

> Finally, you must give strict orders, in my name, that the missionaries be not overwhelmed with the care of temporalities. Some write me that certain establishments seem to be rather *estancias* than missions, that there is a Padre who has three or four thousand animals, and another so many sheep and goats as to surprise those who see [his ranch]. They run the risk that His Majesty may order the stoppage of the alms which he regularly gives for the sustenance of the missionary fathers.[16]

The same packet of January 24, 1655 brought another letter from Nickel to Real:

> I took particular comfort from the copious and clear report that Father Calderón sent on all the missions, and I judge that they are bringing great glory to God and credit to the Company. And on that score I readily agree with those who think that we should not and could not give them up. And I entertain the hope that it will not be difficult [economically] to preserve them after the Council has decided on the principal point of the canonical institution, as Your Reverence understands.[17] That done, we shall be free from the dangers which might threaten the Company if we had to admit conditions that are so onerous, as other orders have found out.
>
> Your Reverence and the other fathers did very well when you did not accept those conditions and preferred to abandon some or many *doctrinas*. That was always the mind of Father Mutius of happy memory. Nor did he decide it only once. In his prudent judgment it was less harmful not to keep *doctrinas* or missions than to subject ourselves to conditions so contrary to our life and institute. Perhaps with the new policy of the Council things will change and they will end this troublesome situation.

On February 22, 1658, Nickel wrote in the same vein to Real:

> The fleet has not arrived, because of the blockade which the English established, as Your Reverence understands. And so we did

---

[16] In a letter from Nickel to Real, printed below, the king is said to give 24,000 pesos yearly for the missions. This was an appreciable sum, but its inadequacy is seen in the story of Father Kino, whose ranches had to produce thousands of cattle to support his missions in Pimería Alta and those of Lower California.

[17] The decision had already been taken by the Council, but it would not be announced for some time. See below on the Paraguay settlement.

not receive the despatches from your province except for a few scattered letters that came in a small boat which was sent after the departure of the fleet.

I shall say no more in particular about keeping the *doctrinas* and missions according to the *Patronato Real,* because Fathers Julian de Pedreza and Diego de Monroy are to advise Your Reverence on the method which has been established in Paraguay without any such hardships as the other orders experience in keeping their *doctrinas.* Truth is that we shall not lack some trials, but we have to tolerate them rather than expose so many souls to danger. The singular liberality with which His Majesty deigns to support our missionaries, giving them as Your Reverence writes 24,000 pesos a year, deserves all our esteem and gratitude.

The following August 20 brought another letter from Nickel to Real. Trouble had arisen, and emotion was ruling the authorities instead of reason. Again the mistake of one man was laid to the blame of the order:

Profound sorrow comes to me with the news that the *cédula* of His Majesty was occasioned by the rebuff given the Señor Viceroy by Father Andrés de Rada. It will be a bad situation, for they want to obligate and subject us to the *Patronato Real* in the point of missions and *doctrinas* in the way they subjected the other religious. If they content themselves with the condition allowed in the province of Paraguay, as was suggested to them, it will be tolerable and you may accept it. To go beyond this will be hard. Your Reverence will do all in your power to dissuade Madrid from obliging us to do what will be so injurious to us, and to urge them to grant your missions and *doctrinas* the same rights that they conceded to Paraguay.

The next provincial, Alonzo Bonifaz, heard from Nickel in a letter sent on November 30, 1659:

Your Reverence must give me the reason why the viceroy forced us to give up the *doctrina* of the Indians at San Gregorio which was in the care of Father Bartolomé González. It was there for the consolation of the poor Indians [of the City] and the other poor as Your Reverence signifies. On our part we had done everything possible to attend to it. As we have kept it for over sixty years we can leave it with a good conscience.

But you have set a bad precedent for our men. Your Reverence writes that you presented that royal provision of petition and charge, by order of the Señor Viceroy, to the Discalced Carmelite Fathers in their chapter, so that if any patent should come from Spain for the provincial, they would not have to admit it or obey it, on the score that His Majesty had given them this particular *cédula.*

And Father Juan de la Real took a bad course in going to the Señor Viceroy to present the patent of provincial which I sent for Your Reverence, especially after I told him beforehand of the trouble that could follow his action.

The behavior of the Captain against our missionaries in Cinaloa is surprising, seeing that we gave no occasion for it. You tell me that the Viceroy, on finding it out, wrote him a severe reprehension and did no more. But I understand that the Lord Bishop of Guadiana, Don Pedro Barrientes, has made or will make a demonstration so that others will not so treat the religious. The experience will do us good and bring credit to our ministry.

The same dispatches brought to Bonifaz a set of instructions to be followed in the pending negotiations wherein the Jesuits were working in Madrid to have the Paraguay settlement applied to New Spain.

After I had concluded all the despatches, I found another letter from Your Reverence dated December 3, 1658. There, after referring to the consultation which you held on order of the Señor Viceroy, regarding the *doctrina* of Tepotzotlán, Your Reverence asked if in the missions of Cinaloa we are to subject ourselves to canonical institution according to the *Patronato Real,* if, for instance, the ministers of His Majesty wish to obligate us to it. Despite the fact that fourteen of the twenty fathers consulting with you thought that we might accept the subjection—six only opposing—, still after treating the matter with the Fathers Assistant I have judged it wise to direct your future attitude in this wise:

1. As long as we do not enter upon an agreement, though others wish to subject us, we are in the same state as before and we enjoy possession and holy liberty without any need of petition or memorial on the matter.

2. In case they try to subject us, Your Reverence and the other fathers must use all possible effort to impede the execution, proposing to the Viceroy and the other ministers that it is contrary to our institute to take charge of the *doctrinas* or missions under such obligations and the grave consequences that would ensue to our government.

3. If neither of the above methods succeeds, then it is proper to appeal to the King and His Royal Council and to represent the reasons that prevent our being saddled with those *doctrinas* on conditions so opposed to our constitutions.

And finally Your Reverence may say that the most that the Company can do in this matter is to undergo any type of examination in language and in letters, and to present three subjects for each *doctrina.* But to change the men or retain them at their posts must be left to the free disposition of the provincial, as he judges fit, and as it has been granted to the province of Paraguay. And if more than this

is demanded, then there is no further possibility of concession, just as no concession was possible for my predecessors.

I feel that if you reply in this manner, with modesty and effectively, they surely must agree to what is most proper for the greater service of God and the most efficacious means for His Majesty to fulfill His holy zeal and also procure the temporal good of the Indies. If any new issue appears in this matter, Your Reverence will inform me so that I may reply.

Goswin Nickel.

Rome, November 30, 1659.

This long set of citations has aimed to show, from the point of view of the Jesuit general and his men in America, the development of the difficulty between mission rights and episcopal authority. From the first days the question had been proposed. It grew in importance with the advancing civilization and the extension of civil power over the formerly unorganized territory. The great problem was to find a satisfactory compromise between the rights of the bishop and the privileged status of the religious. The solution for this perplexing situation was first worked out in the case of the Paraguay Reductions, and the decision was taken on June 15, 1654. Two years later it was applied and went into force. Then came the effort to have New Spain accept the same conditions. The exact date for this decision has not been found by the present author, but it lay at some point between 1660 and 1663.

The status finally fixed by the King and the Council of the Indies may be stated in the following three points:

1. The canonical quality of the missions was changed from that of reductions to that of *doctrinas* or *parroquias*. The religious superior must present three candidates for the office of pastor to the governor for examination. The governor had to select one of these for the place, and to present him to the bishop, who then canonically appointed this man as pastor.

2. The religious pastor, the *doctrinero,* was now subject to episcopal visitation, and he could be removed from office at the instance of the bishop, who, to obtain this removal, must send secret notice and cause for action to the provincial who would then remove him.

3. The religious superior might remove this pastor or *doctrinero* at any time without giving any reason to the bishop.[18]

W. EUGENE SHIELS

[18] A very complete account of this settlement is given in Hernández, 327 sq. The 1654 decision remained in force for the succeeding decades of Jesuit mission work in Hispanic America.

# The Route of De Soto: Delisle's Interpretation

Four hundred years ago last May, Hernando de Soto led the first inland exploration of southeastern United States to be made by Europeans. Where this journey took him has long been a debated question. There have been many suggestions and solutions offered, the latest of which has been made by the United States De Soto Expedition Commission.[1] Source information concerning the journey has been preserved in four narratives, all of which differ in various degrees with regard to its details. The narrative of the Gentleman of Elvas, seemingly written from memory by a Portuguese who accompanied De Soto, was first published in Portuguese at Evora in 1557.[2] The account written by the Inca, Garcilaso de la Vega, who is said to have obtained his information orally from the reminiscences of two or three persons accompanying De Soto, has been very popular although most commentators consider it highly colored. The book was first published in Spanish in 1605 at Lisbon, though the writing of it was finished in 1591.[3] Luis Hernández de Biedma was the *factor* on the expedition; on his return, in 1544, he presented his brief, but important narrative to the king. The first publication of the Biedma version, in French, did not appear until 1841, when it was published by Ternaux-Compans.[4] De Soto's secretary, Rodrigo Ranjel, kept a diary on the trip, which was the basis for his official report turned over to the Spanish government. Both the diary and the official report have been lost, but Oviedo had access to them and utilized the information found therein for his

[1] *Final Report of the United States De Soto Expedition Commission.* 76th Congress, 1st Session, House Document No. 71. Washington, 1939. [See Book Review section of this number of *Mid-America* for a review of the work cited. Editor.]

[2] *Relaçam verdadeira dos trabalhos q. ho gouernador dõ Fernãdo de souto e certos fidalgos portugueses passarom no descobrimẽto da prouincia da Frolida. Agora nouamẽte feita per hũ fidalgo Deluas,* Evora, 1557. There have been various translations of this narrative; the latest, into English, is that of Dr. James A. Robertson, *True Relation of the Hardships Suffered by Governor Fernando de Soto & Certain Portuguese Gentlemen During the Discovery of the Province of Florida. Now newly set forth by a Gentleman of Elvas,* Deland, The Florida State Historical Society, 1932-33, 2 vols. The first volume is a facsimile of the original Portuguese edition.

[3] Garcilaso de la Vega, *La Florida del Ynca. Historia del Adelantado Hernando de Soto, . . .* Lisbon, 1605.

[4] H. Ternaux-Compans, *Voyages, relations et mémoires originaux pour servir a l'histoire de la découverte de l'Amérique . . . ,* Paris, 1837-41, XX, 51-106.

account of the De Soto expedition.[5] However, this part of Oviedo's *Historia* was not published until 1851 in Madrid, so it is only recently that the use of this narrative was made to shed new light upon the route followed by De Soto.[6]

Since the narratives do not agree in the details of either distances or directions, it has been difficult for historians and cartographers to plot De Soto's route with anything like precision. However, several have attempted to do so, and it is these early attempts, especially those of Guillaume Delisle, with which this paper is concerned. As the Delisle map of 1718 is well known for the De Soto line of march shown on it, the attempt is made here to show how the cartographer arrived at his conclusions and what his line of reasoning may have been.

Until the third decade of the seventeenth century the majority of cartographers relied almost exclusively upon the account of De Soto's expedition as given by the Gentleman of Elvas for the nomenclature on their maps of what is now the southeastern part of the United States. The reason for this is that the account of Elvas was published half a century before that of Garcilaso de la Vega, and was well known before the appearance of the latter. The Elvas nomenclature appears on such maps as the Santa Cruz manuscript map[7] and the Chaves map in Ortelius's atlas.[8] Even after the publication of the popular account by Garcilaso, some cartographers such as Mercator,[9] Keer,[10] and Speed[11] continued to use the Elvas place names. The first car-

---

[5] Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo y Valdés, *Historia General y Natural de las Indias, Islas y Tierra-firme del Mar Océano . . .*, Madrid, 1851, I, 544 ff.

[6] The historical value of these four chronicles is discussed by T. H. Lewis, "The Chroniclers of De Soto's Expedition," in The Mississippi Historical Society, *Publications*, VII, 1903, 379-387; by J. A. Robertson in his translation of *Relaçam Verdadeira*, 397-412; and in the *Final Report of the United States De Soto Expedition Commission*, 4-11.

[7] Alonso de Santa Cruz, [Map of the Gulf and coast of New Spain]. Original in Archivo General de Indias, 145-7-8, photograph in the Karpinski Collection. H. Harrisse, *The Discovery of North America*, III, 1892, 643, dates it 1521, but in the text says it is more than twenty years later; P. Torres Lanzas, *Relación Descriptiva de los Mapas, Planos, &, de México y Floridas . . .*, Seville, 1900, I, 17, lists it without date; W. Lowery, *A Descriptive List of the Maps of the Spanish Possessions within the Present Limits of the United States, 1502-1820*, Washington, 1912, 78, gives 1572?.

[8] A. Ortelius, *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum*, Antwerp, 1584, fol. 8.

[9] G. Mercator, *Atlas sive Cosmographicae Meditationes de Fabrica Mundi et Fabricati Figura*, Amsterdam, 1616, 355.

[10] P. Keer, *Americae Nova Descriptio*, 1614, in *Frontières entre le Brésil et la Guyane Française*, Atlas, VI, Paris, 1899, plate 56.

[11] J. Speed, *America with those known parts in that unknowne worlde both people and manner of buildings Discribed and inlarged by I. S. Ano. 1626*, in "A Prospect of the Most Famous Parts of the World," London, 1676, bound with his *The Theatre of the Empire of Great-Britain*, London, 1676, 9.

tographer to adopt the nomenclature in the account of Garcilaso de la Vega, exclusively, was Jean de Laet, in 1625, on his map *Florida, et Regiones Vicinae.*[12]

In view of the importance of Espíritu Santo Bay in Delisle's cartographical work, mention of this geographical feature, as it appears in the above mentioned early maps, should be made. In these maps the name Espíritu Santo was applied both to a bay and a river, but cartographers did not agree as to their respective locations. On the Santa Cruz map the bay appears on the northern coast of the Gulf of Mexico with the river emptying into it. Chaves places the bay on the west Florida coast at what is now called Tampa Bay, but shows the river entering *Mar pequena** on the northern coast of the Gulf. Mercator, Keer, and Speed do not apply the name to a bay on their maps, but only to the river emptying into the Gulf on its northern coast. *Bahía del Spíritu Santo* on the Laet map is on the northern coast of the Gulf of Mexico, extending between latitudes 29° 20′ and 31°, with six rivers flowing into it. On the western coast of Florida, *Bahía de Carlos, Bahía de Tampa,* and *Bahía de S. Iosepho* appear, reading the legends from south to north. North of the last-named bay very near the 30th parallel and in present-day Apalachee Bay is *Tacobago,* but no indication is given whether it is an island or a bay. At the east end of this large bay is an inlet into which flows the *R. del Spíritu Santo.* On the north end of this inlet is *Hirrihigua,* the first village met by De Soto, according to Garcilaso de la Vega. This is at latitude 30° 30′. De Soto's route is not marked, but the villages through which he passed, according to the account of the Inca, are shown to the north of Hirrihigua, indicating the line of march to have been directly north to *Cofachiqui,* along the Rio del Spíritu Santo. The route then turns west through *Chalaque, Xuala,* southwest to *Coza,* and due south to *Tascalusa.* Within the ellipse formed by this route, Laet in-

[12] Printed in Jean de Laet, *Nieuwe Wereldt oft Beschrijvinghe van West-Indien, uit veelerhande Schriften ende Aen-teekeningen van verscheyden Natien* . . . , Leyden, 1625. This was reprinted at Leyden, in 1630, *Beschrijvinghe van West Indien.* . . . Ten years later appeared a French translation, *L'histoire du Nouveau Monde ou description des Indes occidentales,* . . . , Leyden, 1640. The plate of the map of Florida in the French edition is the same as that of the Dutch edition of 1630. J. Sabin, *A Dictionary of Books relating to America,* X, 1878, 15, states that the maps in the various editions of Laet were unchanged.

* Place names on printed maps are herein italicized; those on Ms maps are in quotes.

scribed many other localities which in subsequent maps are placed in the west toward the Mississippi River.[13]

Jean de Laet was one of the cartographers who made Amsterdam the center of map publishing during the first half of the seventeenth century, when Holland was at the height of its power. As the power of Holland declined, that of France rose, and, coincidental with the rise of France, a new cartographer, Nicolas Sanson, began publishing maps in France about 1650. He was the founder of the French school of cartography, and as a result of his industry and influence, the center of map publishing had shifted from Holland to France by the end of the century. In 1648 appeared the first of Sanson's small quarto atlases which were issued separately for Europe, Asia, and Africa and America. Almost simultaneously he began to publish separate maps. In his map of 1650,[14] Sanson carefully copied Laet's map, *Florida, et Regiones Vicinae,* described above, as far as the region traversed by De Soto is concerned. This map is on a smaller scale than Laet's, and a few villages along the route are omitted. A small atlas concerning America was published by Sanson in 1656 which contains a map entitled *La Floride.* This is a modification of his 1650 map with some additions, but in general the Garcilaso de la Vega nomenclature remains the same. On this map is found *B. de Tacobaga* at the eastern end of present-day Apalachee Bay, at latitude 30° 30′, as in Laet's map.

After Sanson's death in 1667, his work was carried on by his two sons in association with Alexis Hubert Jaillot, who was the first of the great Jaillot family of cartographers. In 1674, Jaillot published a map[15] on which the nomenclature for the area under consideration here follows closely that in the French edi-

---

[13] The first French edition of Laet's work, *L'histoire du Nouveau Monde,* greatly influenced Delisle in his cartographical work. There are a number of sketches by Delisle in the Archives Nationales, see *infra,* based on the accounts as retold by Laet. Among them is a sketch (AN, JJ, 75:231) showing Delisle's interpretation of De Soto's route according to Laet. In plotting this route, Delisle took the words of Laet at their face value. He knew that the term Florida applied both to the mainland and to the peninsula, but when he read in Laet "il moüilla l'anchre dans la Baye de *Spiritu Sancto* au Continent de la *Floride*" (pp. 107-108), he made De Soto land, not on the west shore of the peninsula, but on the mainland at what appears to be the present Apalachee Bay. See also AN, JJ, 75:226, "Coste marine de La Floride tirée de Jean Laet."

[14] N. Sanson, *Amerique Septentrionale,* Paris, 1650.

[15] H. Jaillot, *Amerique Septentrionale divisée en ses principales parties . . . Par le Sr Sanson . . . Presentee a Monseigneur le Dauphin Par . . . Hubert Iaillot. 1674.* An undated edition of this map in color was published later in Amsterdam.

tion of Garcilaso de la Vega's account.[16] On this map the *Bahía del Spíritu Santo* is on the north coast of the Gulf with the *R. de Spíritu Santo* flowing into it, as does also the *Chucagua R.*[17] The 30th parallel and 280th meridian cross in the center of the bay.[18]

---

[16] Pierre Richelet, *Histoire de la conquête de la Floride ou Relation de ce qui s'est passé dans la découverte de ce Pays par Ferdinand de Soto*, 2 vols., Paris, 1670. This is not a direct translation, but an adaptation of Garcilaso de la Vega's text. Richelet's book was reprinted in 1709 and again in 1737. B. Shipp translated Richelet's version in *The History of Hernando De Soto and Florida; or, Record of the Events of Fifty-six Years, from 1512 to 1568*, Philadelphia, 1881. The following passage illustrates how Richelet adapted Garcilaso de la Vega:

| Garcilaso de la Vega<br>1605 edition | Richelet<br>1709 edition |
|---|---|
| Del alojamiento de Alibamo que fue el postrero de la prouincia de Chicaça, salio el exercito passados los quatro dias, que por necessidad de los heridos alli estuuo, y al fin de otros tres que camino por vn despoblado, lleuando siempre la via al norte por huyr de la mar, llego a dar vista a vn pueblo llamado Chisca, el qual estaua cerca de vn rio grande, que por ser el mayor de todos les que nuestros Españoles en la Florida vieron, le llamaron el rio grande sin otro renombre. Iuan Coles en su relacion dize que este rio se llamaua en lengua de los Indios Chucagua, y adelante haremos mas larga mencion de su grandeza, que sera de admiracion. f. 229. | Les Espagnols au sortir d'Alibamo marcherent à travers un desert toûjours du costé du Nord pour s'éloigner de plus en plus de la mer, & au bout de trois jours ils appercûrent la Capitale de Chisca, qui porte le nom de sa Province & de son Seigneur. Cette ville est située proche un fleuve, que les Indiens appellent *Chucagua* le plus grand de tous ceux que nos gens ayent vû dans la Floride. II, p. 74-75. |

[17] This is the first appearance of the Chucagua River, the Mississippi, according to B. Shipp, *The History of Hernando De Soto and Florida*, 472, note. The name of this river does not appear on Laet's map, *Beschrijvinghe van West Indien*, because he followed the nomenclature of the *Historia General* . . . , Madrid, [1615], VII, 40, and the name Chucagua is omitted in Herrera's adaptation of Garcilaso de la Vega's account. In speaking of the river the two chronicles have:

| Herrera | Laet |
|---|---|
| Salidos de Alibamo, a tres jornadas al Norte, llegaron a Chisca, junto a vn rio, que llamaron el grande, por ser el mayor de quantos hasta alli auian visto. . . . | Ayans cheminé trois jours *d'Alibamo* vers le Nord, il arriuerent à *Chisca* assis au bord d'vne grande riuiere (qu'ils nommerent pour cette cause *Grande*) . . . p. 113. |

[18] In giving the cartographical positions of the seventeenth century maps, no effort has been made to translate the locations given in the text into modern terms. The main reason is because of the differences on these maps between the meridian grazing East Florida, today the 80th meridian west of Greenwich, and the 99th, which crosses Mexico City. Thus there is a longitudinal distance of 24° between East Florida and Mexico City on the Sanson map of 1650, a difference of 5° from present-day measurements and the Jaillot map of 1674 shows a longitudinal distance of 24° 30′. In Delisle's map of 1700 the meridian grazing the East Florida Coast is 295°, and in his succeeding maps he consistently uses 296° 30′ for that meridian, making the longitudinal distance between East Florida and Mexico City

Jaillot makes a new departure on this map as to the landing place of De Soto. *B. de Juā Ronca* is at latitude 26° 30′, which is actually the position of San Carlos Bay, and on the northern coast of this bay is *Hirriga* where De Soto made his landfall. The villages appear in a line to the north of this place with a jog northwest, to the northernmost point, *Chouala,* on the 39th parallel, the latitude of Cincinnati, Ohio. Then the route continues in a southwesterly curve to *Mauuilla.*

In none of these maps is the route of De Soto indicated by a single or double line from village to village. The first to show a marked line of march was Guillaume Delisle. This route is represented on his map published in 1718. But more than twenty years before, Guillaume's father, Claude,[19] had sketched the route on a map dated 1696, which remained in manuscript. This sketch, with Guillaume's drafts for his map of 1703, is in the collection of manuscripts and maps, formerly belonging to various members of the Delisle family, now preserved in the French archives. "The manuscripts contain not only the notes of Joseph Nicolas Delisle [the astronomer] and memoirs written or received by him, but also notes and memoirs of his father, Claude, and his brothers, Guillaume and Louis de la Croyère."[20] Though the practical value of these papers is less today than it was in the eighteenth century, they are important historically, for they contain, besides the astronomical and navigational papers, notes on the history of geography and cartography, and on various voyages into all parts of the world. Boxes [cartons] IX to XII contain material relating to North America, box XVI, letters to and from Guillaume Delisle, and box XVII, the geographer's writings. The remainder of the collection deals with voyages to other parts of the world and memoirs concerning the history and geography of Russia, Siberia, Africa, Turkey, Arabia, Persia, and Egypt. "The geographical maps of Delisle preserved in the

---

21° and 20°, only 2° and 1° more than the actual distance. Using the East Florida meridian as a guide in these maps, the cartographical positions have been translated into modern terms by subtracting the longitudinal positions as shown on the maps from the East Florida meridian and adding the difference to the modern East Florida meridian, 80°.

[19] In 1696, Guillaume Delisle was only twenty-one years of age; it is more probable that his father, Claude, drew many of the sketches executed before 1700.

[20] Louis de la Croyère, half-brother of Guillaume and Joseph Nicolas Delisle, accompanied the latter to Russia with the idea of aiding him in his astronomical researches. But Louis de la Croyère led such a dissolute life that he accomplished little. Cf. L. Breitfuss, "Early Maps of North-Eastern Asia and of the Lands around the North Pacific," in *Imago Mundi,* 1939, III, 93-94.

Dépôt de la Marine make up part of the 'Petites archives' and comprise portfolios 71-75 of the series of 'Cartes géographiques anciennes.' It is a collection of manuscript and engraved maps, in which the maps of Guillaume are in greater number than those of Joseph Nicolas."[21] The maps, sketches, and drafts of the western hemisphere are found in portfolio 75, *pièces* 125-396;[22] of these, the ones showing the route of De Soto will be considered in detail later.

The difficulties in tracing De Soto's route have been acknowledged by all who have attempted to do so, and because of these difficulties a variety of routes have been suggested for the journey,[23] especially east of the Mississippi River.[24] The first problem is the question of the landfall of De Soto, that is, the location of his Espíritu Santo Bay. That even the early cartographers held different opinions about the point of ingress has already been noted in connection with the maps previously mentioned. However, it is generally held that the bay where De Soto landed and called Espíritu Santo Bay because he disembarked on Pentecost Sunday, was on the west coast of the peninsula of Florida where Tampa Bay is now. Discussions are as plentiful as dissenting opinions, some of fairly recent date, as to the location of Soto's Espíritu Santo Bay. The chroniclers are vague about the actual point of the landfall.[25] Ranjel gives the most detailed description, but it is somewhat confusing. He says: "Land was seen on the northern coast of Florida; and the fleet came to anchor two leagues from shore in four fathoms of water or less. . . . The place where they disembarked was due north of the Island of Tortuga, which is in the mouth of the Bahama channel. The chief of this land was named Oçita, and it is ten leagues

---

[21] A. Isnard, "Joseph-Nicolas Delisle, sa biographie et sa collection de cartes géographiques à la Bibliothèque Nationale," in *Bulletin de la Section de Géographie,* 1915, XXX, 60-61.

[22] Photostats of the maps in this portfolio which are in the Edward E. Ayer Collection, The Newberry Library, Chicago, have been used in this study. They will be referred to as Archives Nationales (AN), JJ, 75.

[23] The various attempts to locate the route are summarized in the *Final Report of the United States De Soto Expedition Commission,* 12-46.

[24] Because several of the sketches discussed only show the line of march east of the Mississippi River, this paper is concerned only with that part of the country covered before the expedition reached Mavilla.

[25] The Portuguese account says, "anchor cast a league from shore, because of shoals. On Friday, the 30th, the army landed in Florida, two leagues from the town of an Indian chief name Ucita," E. G. Bourne, *Narratives of the Career of Hernando De Soto in the Conquest of Florida,* New York, 1904, I, 21-22. Garcilaso de la Vega states, "he came to anchor in a very good bay, which is called Espíritu Santo," B. Shipp, *The History of Hernando De Soto and Florida,* 257. Biedma merely says, "We arrived at the port of Baya Honda," Bourne, *ibid.,* II, 3.

west of the Bay of Johan Ponce."[26] Bourne identifies this as Tampa Bay. John Gilmary Shea,[27] using the Ranjel account, says De Soto landed at the Bay of Juan Ponce, but he makes no effort to identify the place. Grace King[28] also says the landfall was in the Bay of Juan Ponce, and, though she does not identify the bay, she means Tampa Bay, as can be seen from the map of the route in her book. The present Ponce de León Bay is at latitude 25° 15′ which is 2° 15′ south of the southern point of Tampa Bay. Compared with Charlotte Harbor and Tampa Bay, it is not large. Concerning the Ranjel version of the landing place, Lewis says: "His account of the bay in which the landing was made establishes the fact that it was shallow and could not have been Tampa Bay, and in this regard is corroborated by Soto's letter[29] and the Elvas narrative."[30] Arredondo in 1742 stated that De Soto's landing place was "on the Bay of Carlos in latitude 27° 45′."[31] But today's San Carlos Bay is at latitude 26° 30′, one degree south of the southern point of Tampa Bay. In the last few years opinions have been advanced that Charlotte Harbor may have been the place where De Soto landed. In his attempt to locate the landing place, Lewis says: "The landing place is generally accepted as being at Tampa Bay, but the depth and numerous inlets as described do not conform thereto. Ponce de Leon Bay is now believed to have been in Monroe county, on the west side of the southern point of Florida, and 'ten leagues west' (really north) would make the location among the Thousand Islands. Probably the real location was Charlotte Harbor; they having entered it from the south end of San Carlos Bay."[32] Theodore Maynard also holds to this theory, saying, "the ships came to anchor in blue brilliant weather in Charlotte Harbor,"[33] and in a note he states that "Tampa Bay is often given incor-

---

[26] Oviedo, *Historia General y Natural*, I, 546, translation taken from Bourne, *Narratives*, II, 51-54.

[27] J. Winsor, *Narrative and Critical History of America*, Boston, 1884, II, 245.

[28] G. E. King, *De Soto and His Men in the Land of Florida*, New York, 1898, 13.

[29] Lewis refers here to De Soto's letter of July 9, 1539, translated from the Spanish by B. Smith, *Letter of Hernando De Soto*, Washington, 1854, 7-10; also by J. A. Robertson, "Letter Written to the Secular Cabildo of Santiago de Cuba by Hernando De Soto. Espiritu Santo, Florida, July 9, 1539," in *The Florida Historical Quarterly*, 1938, XVI, 174-178.

[30] T. H. Lewis, "The Chroniclers of the De Soto Expedition," in the Mississippi Historical Society, *Publications*, 1903, VII, 385.

[31] H. E. Bolton, ed., *Arredondo's Historical Proof of Spain's Title to Georgia*, Berkeley, 1925, 121, note.

[32] T. H. Lewis, "The De Soto Expedition through Florida," in *The American Antiquarian*, 1900, XXII, 356.

[33] T. Maynard, *De Soto and the Conquistadors*, New York, 1930, 140.

rectly as the landing place."[34] A note by Richard Hakluyt in his translation of the Portuguese narrative[35] gives an opinion which does not seem to have many followers. He states that the landing place "was called Baya de Spirito Sancto, being on the west side of Florida, in 29 degrees ½," near today's Deadman's Bay. Laet, as has been seen, locates the bay in which De Soto landed near the 30th parallel.

The advocates of Tampa Bay as the landing place are many. Most of these merely state that the landfall was at Tampa Bay, but others have attempted to locate the point even more exactly. Rye, Monette, and Wilmer[36] are among those who have placed it at Hillsborough Bay, Fairbanks and Lowery[37] locate the place at Gadsen's Point, and still others at other points within Tampa Bay. In 1934, John R. Swanton published an extract of a document which, in his opinion, contains conclusive evidence that the place name Pooy where De Soto landed was Tampa Bay.[38] This document, dated October 13, 1612 and addressed to the king of Spain by Juan Fernández de Olivera, Governor of Florida, concerns the account of an expedition sent to the gulf coast of Florida in June 1612. Notations of the latitudes of points mentioned on the western coast of Florida are in this document. Swanton says, "The latitudes given are evidently too low, but there is no mistaking the points intended. Pooy can only be Tampa, and the Tampa of the explorers, Charlotte Harbor. . . ." In the passage in the document which Swanton used as his premises, is the phrase "la bahia de pooy que es á donde dizen los yndios desembarco el adelantado Hernando de Soto." It led him to conclude:

> This was written almost precisely seventy-three years after De Soto landed, and, while I am well aware of the fallibility of Indian tradition when extended over a long period of time, seventy-three years may be spanned by a single life, and the landing happened

---

[34] *Ibid.*, 137, note 2.

[35] *The Discovery and Conquest of Terra Florida, by Don Ferdinando De Soto . . . written by a Gentleman of Elvas . . . translated out of Portuguese,* by Richard Hakluyt [1611], edited by W. B. Rye, London, 1851, Hakluyt Society *Publications,* IX, 24.

[36] Rye, *ibid.,* xxxvii; J. W. Monette, *History of the Discovery and Settlement of the Valley of the Mississippi,* New York, 1846, I, 17; L. A. Wilmer, *The Life, Travels and Adventures of Ferdinand De Soto, Discoverer of the Mississippi,* Philadelphia, 1858, 312.

[37] G. R. Fairbanks, *History of Florida,* Philadelphia, 1871, 74; W. Lowery, *The Spanish Settlements within the Present Limits of the United States, 1513-1561,* New York, 1901, 219.

[38] J. R. Swanton, "Landing Place of De Soto," in *Science,* 1934, LXXX, 336-337.

when the parents of most of the adult Indians in Tampa Bay in 1612 were alive. Moreover, the event must have been of exceptional importance to them, as the first intimate contact they had with representatives of the white race. The conclusion seems inevitable that it was in Tampa Bay that De Soto disembarked his army.

After further study, Dr. Swanton published an article wherein he gives his reasons and proofs for declaring the east side of Tampa Bay to be the port, an old Indian town site on Terra Ceia Island to be the Port of the Holy Spirit and Shaw Point to be the landing place.[39] The United States De Soto Expedition Commission has recently published its reasons for believing, without a doubt, that De Soto anchored his ships in Tampa Bay.[40] The native town in which the conquistador established his headquarters was, according to the Commission, on Terra Ceia Island. The conclusions are based, first, among other reasons, upon a comparison of the descriptions of the landing place with the geography of the west coast of Florida; secondly, upon the fact that of the three principal bays, Tampa, Charlotte Harbor, and San Carlos, the former is the one most nearly in a line north of Havana, agreeing with Ranjel's statement; thirdly, upon the testimony of the Indians, taken seventy-three years after the landing; and finally, upon the testimony of López de Velasco as to the identity of the Bay of Espíritu Santo.

These opinions show how various writers interpreted the accounts of the expedition. While few such discussions were in print to confuse Delisle when he was endeavoring to decide just where to start the De Soto route, there was enough evidence available at the time to cause the cartographer no end of trouble in locating the bay where De Soto landed, which was called Espíritu Santo Bay by the chroniclers. Delisle's attempts to decide on the location of this bay are discussed in the succeeding paragraphs.

Another problem to confront those plotting the route of De Soto is that of distances, and to a lesser degree, directions, for the narratives disagree in these details of the journey. Modern students, in the main, agree on the general directions taken, but they have access to two additional accounts unknown to Delisle, those of Biedma and Ranjel. The difference between the Elvas and Garcilaso accounts of the expedition, the only two accounts

---

[39] J. R. Swanton, "The Landing Place of De Soto," in *The Florida Historical Quarterly*, 1938, XVI, 149-173.

[40] *Final Report of the United States De Soto Expedition Commission*, 117-138.

Delisle had, did not escape the French geographer. Since the Elvas account has a carefully tabulated list of consecutive distances and directions, it would seem, therefore, a simple matter to express the route cartographically.[41] The narratives differ in the matter of the nomenclature; though they agree generally on the order in which the various places were visited, some omit certain names, and all show some variation in orthography.

Among the drafts and trial sheets used by Delisle in his cartographical studies of America, are several sketches made when he was attempting to plot the route of De Soto. These sketches show his concern over the geography of the country through which De Soto traveled, as does also an extant list of questions on the route, prepared either by Guillaume or by his father, Claude.[42]

On one of the Delisle sketches of the De Soto route,[43] the cartographer followed the narrative of the Gentleman of Elvas[44] and set down the distances and directions just as the narrator has them, disregarding what he knew from other maps and accounts. He made the landing place of the Spaniards in a bay on the northern coast of the Gulf, approximately midway between the peninsula of Florida and the mouth of what is meant to represent the Mississippi River. Because he was familiar with the map of Laet showing the *Bahía del Spíritu Santo* to be on the northern Gulf Coast, Delisle must have thought it plausible to indicate the landing place on that coast, but above all, the distances and directions of travel as set down by the Gentleman of Elvas demanded a wide expanse of country to the west. On this sketch map, Delisle did not label explicitly the bay at which

---

[41] When there were gaps in a narrative, Delisle found it difficult to plot the route followed by travelers; cf. his letter to Joutel, in J. Delanglez, ed., *The Journal of Jean Cavelier,* Chicago, 1938, 12, "These lacunae upset all the calculations of the geographer, who cannot make use of the distances and the directions when some are missing."

[42] Archives du Service Hydrographique (ASH), 115-10:n. 17, *pièce* X, Library of Congress transcript.

[43] AN, JJ, 75:231. This is the map referred to in the *Final Report of the United States De Soto Expedition Commission,* 13. The Commission had at hand a photostat of the "Seconde Carte" and surmised that there must be a "Première Carte"; it is this "Première Carte" which is described in the text above. The "Seconde Carte," spoken of in the *Report,* only shows the course of the "Rio Grande ou le grand fleuve" (Mississippi River) and the Gulf coast down to Vera Cruz. Just as he did on the "Première Carte," Delisle crowded the course of the river with numerous geographical notes taken from the Elvas account.

[44] *Histoire de la conqueste de la Floride, par les Espagnols, sous Ferdinand de Soto. Ecrite en Portugais par un Gentil-homme de la Ville d'Elvas.* Par M. D. C., Paris, 1685, translated by S. de Broë, seigneur de Citry et de La Guette. This was the first translation into French of this account, and the one used by Delisle.

De Soto landed. He merely sets down "Habitation d'un Seigr. Indien nommé Ucita que Soto noma le port du St. Esprit." According to the Gentleman of Elvas, after disembarking, De Soto and his men traveled one hundred leagues to the west. To Delisle this seemed impossible had De Soto landed on the western coast of the Florida peninsula, for the entire width of that peninsula was known to be much less than one hundred leagues (270 miles), the greatest width of the peninsula being not much more than 2°, which to Delisle's mind meant a little over fifty leagues (135 miles). Even if De Soto had landed on the east coast he could not have marched one hundred leagues to the west. Consequently, Delisle made him land at the old Espíritu Santo Bay in order to get this initial westward leg of the journey on his map. At the end of this one hundred league journey the expedition reached "Anhayca de Apalache" according to the account Delisle was using. Indifferent to anything that was not in this account in sketching the route, he disregarded the fact that Apalache had been placed much to the east of the point at which he places it, that is, not far from the Mississippi River as shown on this sketch.[45] At "Anhayca de Apalache" the expedition turned to the northeast and, according to the Portuguese narrative, traveled in that direction for a distance of four hundred and thirty leagues (1160 miles) until they reached "Cutifachiqui." Delisle has this leg of the journey sketched on his map, placing the terminus almost on the Atlantic coast. This is obviously impossible. A modern map will show plainly that a march of 1160 miles northeast from Baton Rouge would bring one near New York City. On the other hand, one of that distance east northeast would traverse a region which more nearly corresponds to the descriptions of the narrative but would end up two hundred miles out in the Atlantic Ocean.[46] It must have been clear to Delisle that the distances as given by the Gentleman of Elvas were unreliable and probably he also questioned the directions given, but he went on with his sketch, and traced the next leg of the trip as set down by the Gentleman of Elvas, two hundred and fifty leagues north from "Cutifachiqui" to "Xuala." From "Xuala" through "Chiaha" to "Coça" the expedition traveled to the west for a distance of one hundred and ninety leagues. At "Coça" they turned south-

[45] Had the expedition traveled 100 leagues west of present-day Pensacola Bay, it would have crossed the Mississippi River.

[46] These distances as given by the Gentleman of Elvas are discussed in the *Final Report of the United States De Soto Expedition Commission*, 302-304.

ward and proceeded sixty leagues to "Tascaluca." From there they again proceeded westward, through "Maville," to the "Rio Grande" (Mississippi River), a distance of three hundred leagues, according to the Portuguese narrative. All of this Delisle put on the sketch map under consideration.

The map is covered with notes, which the cartographer took from the Portuguese account in his endeavor to plot De Soto's route according to that narrative. Delisle himself left no legend saying that the material embodied in his sketch was from the account of the Gentleman of Elvas, but it clearly appears that this was its origin.[47] In the upper left-hand corner he wrote "Route du voyage de Fernand Soto en Floride." His brother, Joseph Nicolas,[48] wrote as a continuation of the above legend, "en 1539 jusqu'en 1543 tirée à ce que je crois de l'hist. de cette expedition ecrite par l'Inca Garcilasso de la Vega sur les memoires d'une personne qui a eté dans l'expedition de Soto." The internal evidence of the map and a comparison of the two accounts show that Joseph Nicolas Delisle was in error in his belief.

Another undated sketch of this collection [49] shows that Delisle made a further attempt at tracing the route of De Soto. This map shows only the Florida Peninsula and the eastern sea coast as far north as Long Island. In the southeastern part, the geographer tried to make the narratives of the Gentleman of Elvas and of Garcilaso de la Vega agree, and in addition, that of César de Rochefort,[50] for place names from all three of these accounts are found in this sketch.

---

[47] There is a manuscript list of books, memoirs, and maps used for the map of 1703 entitled "Livres memoires Cartes imprimées ou M. S. dont on s'est servi pour dresser la Carte de la Nle France [deleted] Canada du Mississipi et de la Floride qui a eté présenté a Mgr le Cte. de Pontchartrain, Examinez et rec[tifiez] *les uns par les autres*." Among the works he consulted, Delisle mentions "La Conquête de la Floride par Ferdinand de Soto l'an 1539 écrite par un gentilhõe de Portugal de la ville d'Elvas qui accompagna Soto" and "La même histoire écrite Par l'Inca Garcilasso de la vega sur les mémoires d'un au. qui avoit aussi eté dans cette expedition." ASH, 115-10:n. 17, *pièce* M.

[48] For the identification of this handwriting, see AN, JJ, 75:138 and 270.

[49] "Virginie ou Nouvelle Suede," AN, JJ, 75:221.

[50] C. de Rochefort, *Histoire Naturelle des Iles Antilles de l'Amerique par Mr. De Rochefort*, 2 vols., Lyon, 1667, 210-275. "Le savant Abeille, dans une note placée sur un exemplaire de cet ouvrage, a prouvé que son véritable auteur était Louis de Poincy," Barbier, *Dictionnaire des Ouvrages Anonymes et Pseudonymes*, Paris, 1823, II, 137. Rochefort's history was long regarded as authentic, but the historical value of it has decreased, Winsor, *Narrative and Critical History*, II, 289, note. It greatly influenced the Delisles, who long considered the information trustworthy. Claude Delisle made a summary of the geographical data contained in the *Histoire Naturelle*, ASH, 115-10:n. 17, *pièce* Z; and as will be seen, prominent features of the Rochefort nomenclature are found in many of Guillaume Delisle's maps and sketches until 1718.

The landing place of De Soto's army on this map is placed in a bay at approximately latitude 28° 40′, which carries no name except "la Hirrihiagua Cacique" (Vega), and just beneath it "Habitation d'Ucita" (Elvas). Between latitude 29° and 30° is an elongated bay into which flows a river called "Hitanachi ou R. de Spiritu S^to."[51] This bay is labeled "Baye du S^t. Esprit ou Tacobago."[52] At latitude 27° appears "B. de Calos ou de Jean Ponce de Leon," and at approximately latitude 27° 40′ is a point marked "la Tampa." (Today's Tampa Bay stretches between latitudes 27° 30′ and 28°.) The route is very plainly marked, going in a northerly direction and then a short distance to the west where "Anhayca de Palache" is placed.[53] From there the general direction is nearly due east to "Cutifachique" and then directly north through mountains to "Xualla" where it turns west and reaches "Chiaha." Here the clearly marked route ceases, but "Chisca" appears to the northwest of "Chiaha" at latitude 36° 30′. The towns through which De Soto passed are plainly marked, in most cases following the nomenclature as given in the Portuguese account, but in some instances names from Garcilaso de la Vega's account appear also. Occasionally both narrators' names for places are given. While the names directly on the route are from those two accounts, place names from Rochefort's account appear also, applied to general regions, such as "Bemarin," "Amana," "Matique," "Theomi L.," etc.[54]

On this map as a rule, Delisle disregarded distances; in only a very few instances does he attempt to designate the number of days traveled. The directions followed on this sketch are taken from Garcilaso de la Vega's account, and those given in the Portuguese narrative are not taken into consideration.

Among the Delisle sketches in portfolio 75, now under consideration, is a group of three carefully executed maps, one of

---

[51] "S'il n'y a pas une grande riviere à Auté qui vient de bien avant dans les terres du coté du Nord, comment s'appelle cette Riviere en Indien si c'est point Hitanachi et si ce n'est pas cette meme Riviere que l'on appelle la Riviere d'Apalache ou la Riviere St. Esprit." Delisle, "Questions sur la route de Soto," ASH, 115-10:n. 17, *pièce* X.

[52] "Si à l'endroit ou cette Riviere entre dans la mer n'est pas nommé la Baye ou le port du St. Esprit par les Espagnols s'il n'y a pas près de la une plage qui n'a que très peu d'eau, et s'il n'y a pas une Isle appellée Tacobago." Delisle, "Questions sur la route de Soto," *ibid.*

[53] This location corresponds more nearly to that shown by earlier cartographers than does the location Delisle shows on the Elvas sketch. Concerning Delisle's difficulty in the identification of this place, cf. "Questions sur la route de Soto," *ibid.*

[54] A discussion of the various positions and names of a lake on earlier maps is found in W. P. Cumming, "Geographical Misconceptions of the Southeast in the Cartography of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," in *The Journal of Southern History*, 1938, IV, 476-492.

which bears the title, "Carte de la Nouvelle France et des Païs Voisins," dated 1696.[55] The route of De Soto is plainly marked on this map also, and the place names follow those found in the account of the Gentleman of Elvas, though many of those appearing there are omitted. A rather large bay on the west coast of Florida is marked "Baye du S$^{t}$. Esprit ou Tocabago," and at the south end of this bay is found the village "Ucita" at latitude 28° (the same latitude as present Tampa), from which the route marked on this map starts. On the north coast of the Gulf of Mexico is found another "Baye du S$^{t}$. Esprit ou Culata" at latitude 28°, longitude 286°, here 14° west of the east Florida meridian, in modern parlance, near Galveston Bay, whereas on this map it has the position of Mobile Bay. It seems that Delisle had not as yet decided whether or not there was one or two Espíritu Santo Bays.[56] Other points marked on this map on the western coast of Florida are "B. de Carlos" (the name of the southernmost bay is illegible), "la Tampa" (latitude 27°) and "C. Apalache," which is at latitude 31° and well within that large bay.

The general direction of the route of De Soto as marked on this map is north, forming a decided curve from Ucita to "Anhayca Apalache" at longitude 296° 30′ and latitude 31°, then northeast to "Cutifachiqui," which is at longitude 303°, latitude 33° 30′, on a nameless river (apparently the Savannah). The route continues on in a northwesterly direction to "Xula" at longitude 301° and latitude 36° 30′, then bears in a southwesterly direction to "Coça," longitude 296°, latitude 35° 30′, where it turns due south to reach "Tascalusa" at longitude 295° 30′, latitude 32° 30′, and on to Mavilla at longitude 293° 30′, latitude 31° 30′.[57] From there it curves in a northwesterly direction and the Mississippi River is met at approximately latitude 34° 30′. This map includes North America, north of Mexico as far as was known at that time, and the map is in an apparently finished state, though it was never engraved.

Another map[58] from this collection, without title or date, is more detailed than the one described immediately above, in that

[55] AN, JJ, 75:130.

[56] In a memorandum of considerations to be borne in mind in planning and organizing an expedition to the Baye du St. Esprit, for the discovery of the mouth of the Mississippi River, drawn toward the end of the seventeenth century, the writer advised that the leader of the expedition should remember "qu'il paroit dans la carte deux baye du St Esprit l une au nort du cap de la floride et l autre a prez de deux cens lieues plus a l oueste et que c est aparamant celle la pres de laquelle la riviere doit tomber." BN, Mss. fr.n.a., 21393:209.

[57] Mavilla here is inland some distance from the coast.

[58] AN, JJ, 75:128.

more rivers and villages are located, though only a few of the towns through which De Soto traveled are shown. Here, as in the 1696 map, the route is distinctly marked. There are some obvious differences between this map and that of 1696. There is no Espíritu Santo bay marked on the west coast of Florida, but "B. de Jean Ponce" and "B. de Carlos" are there. Instead of "La Tampa," "B. de la Tampa" appears at 27° 30′. "B. Tacobago" is nearly at latitude 30°. Present-day Apalachee Bay is drawn in more detail on this map than on the aforementioned one, and "Cap d'Apalache" is at a point on the far western end of the bay at longitude 289° and latitude 30°. The only "Baye du S$^{t}$. Esprit" appears on the north coast of the Gulf at longitude 283°, latitude 30°, here 12 degrees west of the east Florida meridian, and, as it should be, somewhat east of the mouth of the Mississippi River. But Delisle moved the landing place to the north, making it at "B. Tacoboga" at latitude 30°, two degrees north from the point where he had shown it on the previous map. The name of the village at this landing place is unfortunately illegible on the reproduction which the present writer consulted. The line of march from this point is shown to be directly north to Apalache at longitude 293°, latitude 32° 30′, whence it proceeds in a northeasterly direction to "Cofachi" which is at longitude 290° and almost latitude 35°. Then the line runs to the southeast for a short distance to reach "Cutifachiqui" on a river not far from the Atlantic coast at approximately the same spot in which it appears on the 1696 map. From "Cutifachiqui" the routes goes northwest to "Xuala" located on the 36th parallel, then for thirty miles southwest to "Coça" and due south from there through "Tasculuca," longitude 292°, latitude 33°, to "Maoüila" for about two hundred miles, and from "Maoüila" westward to the Mississippi River. The names along the De Soto route as shown on this map are from the Portuguese account, but as in the previous maps, the distances and directions of Elvas have been disregarded by Delisle, who in this instance took them from the narrative of Garcilaso de la Vega. Also worthy of note is the fact that the De Soto route makes an almost complete circle around "Lake Theomi," while this lake is not shown at all on the 1696 map discussed above.[59]

Delisle's first map of America, entitled *L'Amerique Septen-*

[59] There is another map of this same period, AN, JJ, 75:128, which was engraved but not published. The photostat of the engraved copy which was used for this study has been reduced to such an extent that the names are illegible. Although faint, the route of De Soto is marked, but this reproduction is impracticable for study purposes.

*trionale,* was published in 1700.[60] The route of De Soto is not marked, and only a few villages in that part of the country are located. The only bays along the west coast of Florida named are *B. de Jean Ponce,* at latitude 26°, *B. de Carlos,* at latitude 28°, and *B. de la Tampa,* at latitude 28° 30′, about one degree north of its true location. There is no name on the northernmost bay, along this coast, but at the inland end of it the village *Ucita* (Elvas) appears, longitude 291° 30′, latitude 29° 30′, which today would be five miles west of Pine Point and in the Gulf of Mexico. The only *B. du S. Esprit* appearing on this map is a very short distance to the east of the mouth of the Mississippi River. *C. Apalache* is shown just as on the manuscript undated map described immediately above, at the west end of present Apalachee Bay. The lake, which in former maps Delisle called Lake Theomi, is here at longitude 291°, latitude 33° 30′ (in Henry county, Georgia), though it is not named, and the river connecting it to the Atlantic runs in a southeastern direction, rather than nearly due south as it had on his previous maps. The few place names inscribed along the route taken by De Soto are the following, taken from the narrative of the Gentleman of Elvas: *Ucita, Aute, Apalaché, Cutifachiqui, Chalaque, Xuala, Coça, Tascaluca,* and *Maouila ou Mobila.* Most of these villages are in approximately the same positions as on the 1696 map.

After the publication of the map of 1700, Delisle had more detailed manuscript data from Iberville, who had already sent accounts to him on returning from his first journey to the Mississippi Valley in July 1699. Subsequently the two men carried on a correspondence regarding the geography of that part of the New World,[61] and Delisle became intensely interested in the course of the Mississippi River.[62] In 1701 he drew a sketch[63] in which he embodied much of what Iberville had told him. More interested in the Mississippi Valley, he laid aside, for a time, his problems concerning the route of De Soto. There are no names of Indian villages in the southeastern part of present-day United States

---

[60] *L'Amerique Septentrionale. Dressée sur les Observations de Mrs. de l'Academie Royale des Sciences. & quelques autres, & sur les Memoires les plus recens. Par G. De L'Isle.* Paris, 1700.

[61] For this correspondence, cf. ASH, 115-10:n. 17, *pièces* M, Q, T, Y; n. 18, 19, 20.

[62] Cf. "Lettre de Mr. Delistle à Mr. Cassini, sur l'embouchure de la Riviere Mississippi" in J. F. Bernard, *Recueil de voyages au Nord,* 1732, IV, 555-568, and see Claude Delisle's autograph draft of this letter, ASH, 115-10:n. 17, *pièce* B.

[63] "Carte des Environs du Missisipi. Par G. De l'Isle, Geographe," AN, JJ, 75:253. This is a basic draft which the cartographer used for later maps.

taken from the De Soto accounts on the 1701 sketch, with the exception of "Cafitaciqui," which he places on the Santee River at latitude 33°.[64] "Les Apalaches habitation des Espagnols" appears on the coast of present Apalachee Bay at the mouth of the "Riviere d'Apalache." "Baye de Spiritu Santo" is located on the western coast of Florida, between latitudes 27° and 28°, and there is no indication of a bay by that name on the northern coast of the Gulf of Mexico. Delisle made additions to this draft and then had it engraved with the date 1701.[65] However, this was not published.

His map of 1702[66] is another engraved version based on the 1701 draft. Again De Soto nomenclature has been disregarded. "B. du S$^{t}$. Esprit" remains in the same location as in the 1701 map. "Lac de Theomi" is on this map at latitude 33° in a ridge of mountains, whereas on the preceding map the lake, though present in approximately the same position, was left nameless.

In 1703 Delisle published his map of Mexico and Florida.[67] Between the time that Delisle drew his map of 1702 and the publication of his 1703 map, he had received letters, copied memoirs, and had interviews with Iberville and others who had returned from the Mississippi Valley. As a result of the added information thus obtained, Delisle changed the manuscript copy of his 1703 map. This had been ready for engraving, for on the copy that went to the engraver, one of the several *papillons* had been placed over the most part of Spanish Florida and New Mexico. As the map was printed, the *Baye du S$^{t}$. Esprit* is still on the west coast of Florida at approximately latitude 27° 30′, just about one degree north of the *Baye de Carlos*. Again, as on his maps since 1700, Delisle almost disregarded De Soto nomenclature, as taken from the two accounts. But here are still found some of the names appearing in Rochefort's history, notably, *Bemarin, Amana,* and *Matique*. However, *Cutifachiqui* appears in its usual place on the Santee River at latitude 33° and *Apalache* is in the

---

[64] There are no longitudes given on this sketch.

[65] Bibliothèque du Service Hydrographique (SHB), C 4040-4, photostat in the Karpinski Collection. The words "Donné par Mr. d'Iberville en 1701" were added to the title of the engraved copy.

[66] "Carte du Canada et du Mississipi. Par Guillaume De l'Isle de l'Academie Royale des Sciences. 1702." Paris, Affaires Etrangères.

[67] *Carte du Mexique et de la Floride des Terres Angloises et des Isles Antilles du Cours et des Environs de la Riviere de Mississipi. Dressée Sur un grand nombre de mémoires principalemt. sur ceux de Mrs. d'Iberville et le Sueur. Par Guillaume De l'Isle Géographe de l'Académie Royale des Sciẽces.* Paris, 1703. The manuscript draft entitled, "Carte du Mexique de la Floride et des terres des Anglois en Amerique avec les Isles adjacentes" is in AN, JJ, 75:266.

center of present Wilcox county, Georgia. *Chalaque* is a territory, around Augusta, Georgia, today. The lake is present, though unnamed, and just above it, the *Pays des Cofachi*. On the manuscript copy of this map, Cutifachiqui is absent entirely, even though the *papillon* does not extend as far east as the Santee River upon which Delisle usually located this town.

For fifteen years after the publication of his 1703 map, Delisle published no maps of America. During that time he was assembling additional material. By the *Carte de la Louisiane et du cours du Mississipi* in 1718,[68] Delisle made public his conclusions regarding the route De Soto followed. The manuscript draft in color, which he sent to the engraver, is in the Archives Nationales.[69] On this draft the route is plainly marked with a dotted line. "Tampa" is at latitude 28° 30′, but "La Baye du S$^{t}$. Esprit" is mapped as a large bay, with several islands, extending practically the entire width of the peninsula of Florida between latitudes 26° and 28° (the southernmost point shown on the map). The landing place of the conquistador, labeled "Debarquement de Fernand Soto l'an 1539," is shown to be on a northern extemity of this bay at a point slightly north of latitude 27° 30′, actually the southern extremity of Tampa Bay. The trail goes inland in a northeasterly direction forming a small curve to another point on the north of the bay. From that point it goes north northeast and then northwest to a place marked "Icy etoient cy devant les Apalaches." Turning to the northeast the route goes through "Ocuté" and the territory called "Apalachicoli," to "Cutifachiqui," which is reached after a slight jog to the southeast. This village is shown to be on the "R. Santé ou Jourdain," longitude 297° and slightly below latitude 34°, which would place it in Marion county, South Carolina. From there the trail goes north through mountainous country to a village of the "Cheraqui," and thence in a northwesterly direction for a short distance to "Chouala," longitude 295° 30′, latitude 36° 30′, in Alleghany county, North Carolina. From "Chouala" through "Chiaha" to the "Conchatez" villages, located in Marion and Grundy counties, Tennessee, the direction is west-southwest. The route goes on through "Tascaloussa" in a direction southwest by south to the northern end of the "Baye de la Mobile." From there a gen-

[68] This has often been reproduced, most recently in J. A. Robertson's translation of *Relaçam Verdadeira*.

[69] "Carte de la Louisiane et du Cours du Mississipi. Dressée sur un grand nombre de memoires entr'autres sur ceux de Mr. le Maire. Par Guillaume Del'isle de l'Academie Royale des Sciences." (Paris, May 1718) AN, JJ, 75:234.

eral northwest direction is taken and the Mississippi is crossed at "Pointe d'Oziers," latitude 34° 30′, exactly at Helena, Arkansas. In comparison with his former maps there are comparatively few decidedly De Soto names on this one. Noticeable too, is the disappearance of Lake Theomi and also of the Rochefort nomenclature.

An often used version of the 1718 Delisle map is that published by B. F. French.[70] Upon examination various important changes in the De Soto route may be observed, though French says in his preface, "The valuable and rare map accompanying this volume is a well-executed *fac simile* of the original. It aspires to a degree of accuracy that is of great importance both to the historian and antiquarian." Whoever made this map for French's publication, used the variant which appeared in Bernard,[71] and not the original published map of 1718. In French's version, *Espiritu Santo Baye* appears to be a rather small bay at approximately latitude 28°, and *Tampa* is placed on the coast in the same latitude. The landing place is at *Tampa* and bears the legend *De Soto landed 31 may 1539.* This is the only English legend on the map. *Ucita, Cale, Capachiqui, Mauvila,* and other De Soto names are along the route which follows the same course as in other variants of this 1718 map, until the village of *les Conchatez* is reached. At this point the route on the original map goes southwest by south to Mobile Bay, but in French's version the line of march is shown to be directly west to the *R. Tombeckbe* (Tombigbee) and on to *Chisca,* which is very near the Mississippi River. The cartographer may have intended this spur from the Tombigbee River to *Chisca* to represent the course taken by the small party De Soto sent out in search of copper.[72] At the Tombigbee River the route is shown to go to the southeast to *Tascaloussa,* then southwest to Mauvila and south to Mobile Bay, thus proving to be quite different from that drawn and published by the cartographer himself. To date there seems to be

---

[70] B. F. French, *Historical Collections of Louisiana,* Philadelphia, 1850, *part ii,* frontispiece.

[71] In 1734, in J. F. Bernard, *Recueil de voyages au Nord,* V, 37, appeared a variant of this map on which the route and the nomenclature along the route remains the same as that originally published. The few changes and omissions are not connected with De Soto's trip. The map having been cut at longitude 298° and latitude 28°, does not show the landing place. The same plate was used for the map appearing in the Amsterdam, 1737 edition, of Garcilaso de la Vega's account printed in his *Histoire des Yncas, Rois du Perou.*

[72] J. A. Robertson, *True Relation,* II, 109.

no evidence that Delisle himself made changes on the 1718 map as originally published.[73]

De Soto's route, as finally plotted by Delisle, cannot be expected to be in complete agreement with that laid down by the United States De Soto Expedition Commission, yet it follows the latter surprisingly close, considering the circumstances under which Delisle worked. In the first place, he never visited America, and consequently had no first-hand knowledge of the topography of this region. He had to rely entirely upon data furnished him by travelers, many of whom did not themselves go over the territory in question. The many changes and corrections on his sketches show how puzzled the cartographer was by these reports. In the second place, he had only two of the original narratives, lacking the one, that by Ranjel, which has proved most useful to later students. He was not able to check the various sources with the existing sites, as Dr. Swanton and his Commission have done, nor was he able to identify place names through a knowledge of Indian languages. Consequently his line of procedure was quite different from that of later scholars. Certain points along the route, such as Apalachee, Coça, and some places west of the Mississippi River, Delisle located with sufficient precision.[74] The curve De Soto made to reach Cutifachiqui is shown by Delisle to be about a degree and a half east of that traced by the Commission, thereby placing the village on the Santee, instead of on the Savannah River. The northernmost point reached by the expedition as shown by the Commission is at the same latitude as that shown by Delisle, but approximately two degrees to the west of Delisle's interpretation. From Xualla to the point where the expedition turned south, Delisle places the route about three degrees east of that located by the Commission, but on the next leg of the journey to Mabila, the Commission's route is about one degree east of that of Delisle.

BARBARA BOSTON

---

[73] In his *Découvertes et Etablissements de Cavelier de La Salle de Rouen dans l'Amérique du Nord,* Rouen, 1870, G. Gravier published an adaptation of this map, using only that information which would further his purpose. He retained the route as it was published by B. F. French. The Delisle map in Winsor, *Narrative and Critical History,* II, 294, is a sketch drawn after Delisle's original 1718 map.

[74] *Final Report of the United States De Soto Expedition Commission,* 291.

# Mlle. De Roybon D'Allonne: La Salle's Fiancée?

The story of La Salle's financial affairs in the New World is replete with woes. Shipwrecks, thefts, embezzlements, disloyalty, and endless discouragements of a soul-trying nature were his. Especially embarrassing were the reverses he met until 1681, when he returned to Fort Frontenac, present-day Kingston, Ontario. The single-decked ship *Frontenac* was lost in January 1679.[1] The *Griffon,* first large sail boat on the Great Lakes, in which he was heavily interested, was totally lost on its return voyage.[2] A ship bringing supplies from France went down at the mouth of the St. Lawrence.[3] Added to these maritime misfortunes was the desertion of some of his men, who pillaged his stores and made off with his peltries.[4] M. Thouret, one of his business associates, died.[5] Creditors in France and in Canada were becoming impatient and could no longer be satisfied with promises, and one, François Plet, a Parisian merchant who had advanced much to La Salle, came to Canada to investigate.[6] Clearly, some of the reverses could be attributed to lack of business acumen on La Salle's part. Conscious of this deficiency La Salle proposed to entrust the trade of Fort Frontenac to a clerk to be selected by his business associates in France, and, thus unburdened of financial details, set himself free to fulfill his commission to explore the west.[7] For three years he had had repeatedly to postpone the great undertaking with which his name has become indissolubly linked—the descent of the Mississippi to the Gulf of Mexico. Only two years remained before the expiration of his commission.

With this great adventure in mind La Salle, in 1681, was in dire need of money. From his arrival in New France he had

---

[1] P. Margry, *Découvertes et Etablissements des Français dans l'Ouest et dans le Sud de l'Amérique Septentrionale,* Paris, 1876-1888, II, 67, 214, 228; cf. I, 296-298, 576; M. B. Anderson, *Relation of the Discoveries and Voyages of Cavelier de la Salle from 1679 to 1681,* Chicago, 1901, 22 (to be referred to *Relation of the Discoveries*); cf. the letter of Frontenac to Colbert, October 9, 1679, Archives des Colonies (AC), C 11A, 5:6.

[2] Margry, II, 67, 73, 76, 228; *Relation of the Discoveries,* 44-46.

[3] Margry, II, 63, 65, 68, 228; Frontenac to Colbert, October 9, 1679, AC, C 11A, 5:6.

[4] Margry, II, 67, 70, 106-107, 109; *Relation of the Discoveries,* 172.

[5] Margry, II, 222.

[6] *Ibid.,* 69, 110, 223, 232, 262.

[7] *Ibid.,* 86, 91, 223.

tapped every source, had borrowed from family and friends in France, from fellow adventurers, supporters, and merchants in Canada.[8] Owing to his brother's impatience in 1679 his credit both in the homeland and in the colony was practically ruined,[9] and in 1681 the merchants of Montreal and Quebec were suing him.[10] He could turn nowhere for backing. All had lost faith in him, except a woman who was then at Fort Frontenac, Madeleine de Roybon d'Allonne. In 1683, when La Salle was on the eve of his departure for France, never to return to Lower Canada, accounts were drawn up listing those to whom he owed money and the extent of his indebtedness to each. One of his obligations reads:

2,141 livres to Mademoiselle d'Allone. A note of the said Sieur de la Salle, dated Fort Frontenac, August 24, 1681, by which note he acknowledges owing her the said two thousand one hundred and forty-one livres, which he promises to repay, viz., eight hundred livres in beaver pelts in the autumn of the same year and the rest next spring in various merchandise suitable for trade, which M. de la Forest will have near Montreal.[11]

The identity of this woman who still believed in La Salle is given in an article published a few years ago in the *Larousse mensuel:*

Born at Montargis about 1646,[12] probably of a family that came originally from Dauphiné, she was the daughter of a Gâtinais lordling, who had served as man-at-arms in the king's company and had held a small position at court, that of carver. Like many other ladies of noble birth of the time, Miss de Roybon doubtless came to Canada to find a husband. She found adventure. La Salle made her land grants around his fort [Frontenac], which, however, were contested. . . . It

---

[8] E.-M. Faillon, *Histoire de la colonie française en Canada,* Villemarie, 1866, III, 313; *Jugements et délibérations du Conseil Souverain de la Nouvelle France, (1663-1710),* 6 vols., Quebec, 1885-1891, II, 332; Bibliothèque Nationale (BN), Mss. fr. n. a., 9293:19v, 107, 131-121v, 125, 301-302, 304; Archives de la Marine (AM), B 1, 52:248-250, 590v-591; Margry, I, 280, 291-292, 423-424, 425, II, 83, 113-114. In November 1683, a list of La Salle's creditors was made, it was drawn a second time and amplified in October 1701, AC, C 11A, 19:156-161, and presented to Champigny, the intendant of New France; in the list printed in Margry, I, 427-432, there are several omissions.

[9] Jean Delanglez, *The Journal of Jean Cavelier,* Chicago, 1938, 27-32.

[10] *Jugements et délibérations,* II, 368, 724; Margry, II, 25-26.

[11] Estat de ce qui est dû . . ., October 1701, AC, C 11A, 19:158; Margry, I, 431.

[12] See C. Tanguay, *Dictionnaire généalogique des familles canadiennes,* Montreal, 1871-1890, III, 356, and *Bulletin des Recherches Historiques,* XXV, 1919, 278.

seems as though Le Sage in his *Aventures . . . de Beauchesne,*[13] to draw the character of his strange Mlle. du Clos, borrowed several traits from the no less strange Mlle. d'Allone.[14]

Elsewhere in the same article the author says: "La Salle spent most of his time at Fort Frontenac during the years 1675-1677 and 1678-1679." Besides the garrison and workmen, in 1677, "there were a few settlers, in all about fifty people. . . . According to all appearances, the fort housed for La Salle a much more agreeable company—Madeleine de Roybon d'Allonne, one of the most romantic women who came to New France. La Salle must have made her acquaintance at Quebec." The same author wrote to the present writer concerning some obscure points of La Salle's life in America: "What was the name of La Salle's fiancée? She was related to the best families of the colony, Parkman tells us. This circumstance rules out Madeleine de Roybon d'Allonne, who came alone of her kind to Canada. It is nevertheless undeniable that she held a great place in his life. I have been asking myself for a long time whether she was not the 'creature' with whom he was living at Fort Frontenac."

To reconstruct what M. de Bonnault is inclined to consider La Salle's romance in America, the first fact to ascertain is the date of the arrival of Miss de Roybon in Canada, and the second, the date of her going to Fort Frontenac. Unfortunately, neither date has been learned. That of her arrival in Canada will probably remain unknown, but her coming to Fort Frontenac can be ascertained with some probability from extant documents.

La Salle, it may be asserted, did not enjoy the agreeable companionship of Miss d'Allonne at Fort Frontenac from 1675 to 1677, for the reason that her name does not appear on the roster of persons at the fort, made at the end of this period.[15] The names were taken in the presence of Frontenac himself, and the purpose of the roll call was precisely to show evidence of progress since 1675. If the young lady rejoicing in so glamorous a name as de Roybon d'Allonne had been present and if the new settlement could already boast of the presence of an authentic noblewoman, it is difficult to believe her name would have been omitted. Nor can it be said that she may have been absent, in

---

[13] Le Sage, *Les Avantures de Monsieur Robert Chevalier, dit de Beauchesne, capitaine de Flibustiers dans la nouvelle France,* 2 vols., Paris, 1732. The adventures of Mlle. Marguerite du Clos are in Vol. II, Bk. IV and V.

[14] M. Claude de Bonnault, "Cavelier de la Salle," *Larousse mensuel,* X (October 1935), 231.

[15] Margry, I, 296-298.

Montreal or in Quebec, on business, or ill, because the names of absentees are entered on the list and the cause of absence given.

La Salle left for France in November of 1677, returning to Quebec on September 15, 1678.[16] During the last quarter of this year, more probably, he met Madeleine either in Quebec or Montreal. She accompanied him to Fort Frontenac either in December of 1678 or at the latest in the following spring. The movements of La Salle seem to give substance to this hypothesis. As will be seen, in 1679, one of his business partners in Paris had heard that La Salle had married. For six weeks after his arrival in mid-September 1678, he lay ill at Quebec, according to his letter to Thouret.[17] On October 26, he was sufficiently recovered to attend the "brandy parliament."[18] He left Quebec November 10, arriving in Montreal November 21. Thence he departed five days later[19] and reached Fort Frontenac December 16.[20] He went to Niagara, where the *Griffon* was being built. With the work in progress, he returned to his fort,[21] and remained there until July of 1679.[22] The land grants to Miss d'Allonne, mentioned by M. de Bonnault and specified in the document of a later date printed below, were made either at this time or in one of the two subsequent visits paid by La Salle to the fort.

From July 1679 to the end of February 1680, La Salle was on the shores of Lake Michigan and in the Illinois country. He left Fort Crèvecoeur for Fort Frontenac, March 2, 1680.[23] The

---

[16] Mémoire sur la conduite du S[r] de la Salle, dated November 11, 1680, AC, F 3, 2:58, printed in Margry, II, 31-32; Memoir of Tonti, in B. F. French, *Historical Collections of Louisiana*, New York, 1846, *part i*, 52. Tonti in his first memoir, Margry, I, 574, has September 13. Bernou (*Relation of the Discoveries*, 14), and Hennepin (*Description de la Louisiane*, Paris, 1683, 16), have "à la fin de septembre." These two narratives are really one and the same thing.

[17] Margry, II, 75. This is not mentioned in Tonti's first memoir.

[18] *Jugements et délibérations*, II, 253; Margry, I, 414-417.

[19] Margry, I, 574; cf. *Jugements et délibérations*, II, 332.

[20] Margry, I, 575; cf. *Relation of the Discoveries*, 14; *Description de la Louisiane*, 22.

[21] Tonti's first memoir, Margry, I, 578; Tonti's second memoir is printed by French, *Historical Collections of Louisiana, part i*, 53; *Description de la Louisiane*, 42.

[22] La Salle left Fort Frontenac in the second half of July, cf. *Jugements et délibérations*, II, 333, rather than at the beginning of August, as stated by Bernou in the *Relation of the Discoveries*, 28. Having passed through the Seneca country, Margry, II, 35, 215, 217, 219, he reached the shipyard of the *Griffon* late in July. The ship was ready to sail August 7, Margry, II, 214; cf. Margry, I, 579.

[23] La Salle has March 1 in one of his letters, Margry, II, 117; this is repeated by Bernou, *Relation of the Discoveries*, 148. March 2 is found in an earlier letter of the explorer, Margry, II, 55, and in the deposition of Moyse Hillaret, Margry, II, 109. Tonti has March 10 in his first memoir, Margry, I, 583.

reason he gives for the journey was the need of anchors, cables, and rigging to complete the boat in the stocks on the shores of Lake Peoria. He would have sent men to Niagara for these, but, since they were badly shaken by tales of terrible perils awaiting them on the Mississippi journey, he feared that once they had arrived in Niagara they would not return to the Illinois. Hence, La Salle decided to make the journey himself.[24] If Miss Roybon was his fiancée, a final motive for the greatest feat of determination and endurance of his whole career is supplied. He came into Fort Frontenac on May 6, 1680,[25] after a trek of more than two months through ice, snow, sleet, and water.

Shortly after his arrival, he went to Montreal on business,[26] stayed a week, then returned to Fort Frontenac to await news from his associates in France, due with the ships. He would have stayed longer but for bad news from the west coming at the end of July. He departed for the scene of the massacre and the west in the first week of August.[27]

A year later, July 1681, he was again at Cataracouy. Fort Frontenac apparently was not his objective when he left the mouth of the St. Joseph River, Michigan, May 25, 1681. He had gone to Michilimackinac, expecting to find La Forest there, but the latter had changed his plans. "I was obliged," wrote La Salle, "to come to Fort Frontenac, where I received such pressing letters from M. de Frontenac, that I had to go to Montreal. This was a useless loss of time, for I did not find him there."[28] While in Montreal, La Salle made his last will.[29] It was after his return to his fort on Lake Ontario that Miss de Roybon loaned him 2,000 livres. Shortly thereafter he left for Michilimackinac, this time on his way to the Gulf.

The passage in Parkman referred to by M. de Bonnault reads as follows: "On one occasion La Salle's forbearance was put to a severe proof, when wishing to marry a damsel of good connections in the colony, Abbé Cavelier saw fit for some reason to interfere and prevent the alliance."[30] Parkman gives as his au-

---

[24] Margry, II, 51, 55; *Relation of the Discoveries*, 134.

[25] Margry, II, 64; *Relation of the Discoveries*, 168.

[26] Margry, II, 69; *Relation of the Discoveries*, 170. From a later letter of La Salle, Frontenac, it seems, had ordered him to come to Montreal, cf. Margry, II, 119.

[27] Margry, II, 69, 73. He was at Teloalagon August 22, *ibid.*, 115. Cf. Bernou's version in *Relation of the Discoveries*, 170.

[28] Margry, II, 158; cf. another letter of La Salle, *ibid.*, 119, and *Relation of the Discoveries*, 296. Frontenac was in Quebec at this time, cf. *Jugements et délibérations*, II, 581 ff.

[29] AC, F 3, 2:80, printed in Margry, II, 183.

[30] *La Salle and the Discovery of the Great West*, Boston, 1907, 102.

thority a "Letter of La Salle in the possession of M. Margry." Until the letter is found it is safer to suspend judgment about the intention to marry, the "good connections," and the interference, since they may have been an interpretation of Margry. Parkman does not seem to have seen the letter, but merely to have taken Margry's word for it. If Jean Cavelier interfered it must have been in the first months of 1679.

Where M. de Bonnault speaks of the "creature" with whom La Salle was living at Fort Frontenac, he has in mind a passage of the notorious document entitled by Margry "Récit d'un ami de l'abbé de Galineé." The passage reads:

> About this time an inhabitant of Quebec came to France and told the elder brother of M. de la Salle that the latter nobleman had seduced a woman in Quebec, whose name he mentioned. The bishop had been unable to make La Salle leave her; he had taken her to his fort where he was living with her in a most scandalous manner. This elder brother, a very pious ecclesiastic, was of great assistance to La Salle in the way of credit and money for his affairs in Canada. The news greatly disturbed him. The only way for him to set his mind at rest was to go there himself and either to withdraw his brother from this alleged debauchery, or to ascertain his innocence and go on helping him, without hesitation, as he had done before. He left [France for Canada] and finding no one in Quebec who had heard anything of this supposed debauchery, he set out for Fort Frontenac to dispel whatever doubt might still be lingering in his mind. There he found a well regulated household [receiving] frequent instructions, and his brother very assiduous in attending all the services to give an example to his entire household.[31]

This story, like most of the *Récit,* is made out of whole cloth. From the context, the date given, *vers ce mesme temps,* places the happening after La Salle's return to Canada in September 1678. At that time, the elder brother, Abbé Jean Cavelier, was still in Canada, hence he had not to come back from France. After Cavelier left New France in November 1679,[32] he was not seen again on the Lower St. Lawrence until nine years later, and then he did not pass through Fort Frontenac.[33] There is no record

---

[31] Archives Nationales, K 1232:64-65; Margry, I, 381-382. In the margin of Margry's manuscript copy, BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 9288:30-30v, there is the note: "Etait-il marié?" Margry was led to ask himself this question because the French text reads that when Cavelier arrived at Fort Frontenac, "il n'y trouva quune *famille* bien reglée, des instructions frequentes, et son frere fort assidu a tous ces exercices pour donner exemple at toute *sa famille.*" Later Margry cancelled the question.

[32] Delanglez, *Journal of Jean Cavelier,* 28 and 30.

[33] Cf. Joutel's journal in Margry, III, 519-520.

that Cavelier ever went to Catarocouy during the thirteen years he spent in Canada. There is another contradiction in the paragraph of the *Récit,* namely, even if Cavelier had come back in 1679, he could hardly have been edified at the good example given by La Salle, because when he would have arrived at Fort Frontenac, the explorer was on the shores of Lake Michigan. As was said, La Salle returned to Fort Frontenac in 1680. In his letter to Thouret of that year, he not only does not mention this visit in speaking of his brother, but accuses him of having done more harm than all his competitors put together.[34]

The author of the *Récit,* however, had heard of some rumors that reached Paris in 1679. Some of La Salle's correspondents "thought it to their interest that he should remain a single man; whereas, it seems that his devotion to his purpose was not so engrossing as to exclude more tender subjects."[35] Among these correspondents was M. Thouret who had advanced large sums of money to La Salle. Writing to the explorer, he seems to have objected to any thought of marriage. La Salle answered:

> They write me too that you have been uneasy about my supposed marriage. I was not even thinking of marriage at that time; and I shall not marry till I have given you reason to be satisfied with me. It is a little extraordinary that I should have to give an account of a matter which is quite free to everybody.[36]

La Salle wrote this passage of his letter about the end of September 1680, one year and a half after "that time" when he had no thought of marriage. He says nothing of his present intentions, except that he would not marry until he had satisfied Thouret. Could he have been considering matrimony at the time of the letter? One wonders. If he was thinking of marrying at "this" time—an hypothesis not ruled out by the text—it is difficult to find whom his choice could be except Miss de Roybon. The "fiancée" assuredly was a woman of Fort Frontenac, not of Quebec or Montreal. For all we know, Madeleine was the only unmarried woman at the fort, certainly the only lady of sufficiently high social status for La Salle's consideration. On her part she was enough interested in him to loan him 2,000 livres, a tidy sum in those days, and, perhaps, her dowry.

Away from Fort Frontenac for two years, La Salle returned in September 1683, to find the fort and its surroundings in a

---

[34] *Journal of Jean Cavelier,* 27-32.
[35] Parkman, *La Salle,* 312.
[36] Margry, II, 88.

ruinous state, due it is stated in a memoir presented to M. de Seignelay, to organized pillage connived at if not abetted by the new governor, Lefebvre de la Barre. "Coming back from his discovery [of the mouth of the Mississippi] and arriving in Quebec, all that the sieur de la Salle was able to obtain from M. de la Barre was that his fort be given back, but without any compensation for what had been stolen and for the wrong done him and his creditors."[37]

While in Quebec, a list of La Salle's creditors was drawn up and the amount he owed each one set down. In this list, as was said before, dated November 3, 1683, is found the statement that Miss de Roybon loaned him 2,141 livres in 1681. La Salle had not yet reimbursed her; he did not wish to depart merely leaving her a note of indebtedness. She had followed him to Quebec, and he compensated her as best he could in the circumstances. The following holograph note speaks for itself:

Robert Cavelier Escuyer S$^{r}$ Da la Salle seigneur et gouverneur au Fort frontenac en la nouvelle France reconnois avoir laissé a damoiselle de Roybon la jouissance de la maison et de la terre quelle a occuppee jusqua present au fort frontenac scavoir la maison qui a esté cy devant a Cauchois et l'habitation que Michaut avoit vendue au S$^{r}$ Dautray que jay depuis racheptee jusqua ce que iaye payé lad$^{te}$ damoiselle de Roybon de ce que ie luy doibs pour l'interest de son argent sans que personne luy puisse inquieter faict a Quebec le 6$^{e}$ novembre 1683.

Dela Salle

On the back of this note is written: "pour Mademoiselle dalonne a Quebec."[38] A few days later, La Salle embarked for France, he was never again to see Miss de Roybon. She returned to Catarocouy. The following year, she saw the army La Barre was leading against the Iroquois melt away under the palisades of Fort Frontenac.

During this time La Salle was searching for his "fatal river." Judging from a letter of Jean Michaud, a settler of Lachine, Miss d'Allonne was not indifferent to his fate. The letter deals with some property Michaud owned at Fort Frontenac, which she wished to acquire. Others wanted it and had asked for it, but Michaud preferred to transfer it to her "in preference to all others," because he was persuaded of her honesty and because he knew that by dealing with her everything would be done according to the rules of equity. After some domestic details the

[37] Margry, III, 36.

[38] Archives du Séminaire de Québec (Laval University), *Polygraphie*, Carton 27, No. 60.

writer continues: "I must tell you that I have reliable news of M. de la Salle, which come from France and which was learned through the Spaniards. He has built a fort in New Mexico assisted by the Indians who inhabit those parts. Therefore, with the help of God, we hope shortly to see him, having brought his undertakings to a successful issue."[39] The hope expressed by Jean Michaud was frustrated. La Salle was killed in the wilds of Texas five months after this letter was written.

Miss d'Allonne was still at the fort in 1687, when Denonville perpetrated his treachery against the Iroquois. The campaign of the governor against the Seneca, was, as is well known, a complete fiasco. It only enraged the Indians. Denonville had hardly returned to Quebec, when the Iroquois braves began raiding the French settlements in retaliation.

Oneida, Onondaga, Mohaks were swarming around Cataracouy. An Indian party seized "three soldiers and Mademoiselle d'Allonne; they made her climb on a stump with the hat of the Black Kettle on her head."[40] Her capture, at the beginning of August 1687,[41] brought her to the fore and very much in evidence for the next few months. Her capture and its sequel is found in an anonymous account, dated Quebec, October 30, 1688:

> Miss d'Allonne and three soldiers belonging to the garrison of Fort Frontenac, having been surprised, by 40 Iroquois of the Mohawk, Onondaga and Oneida cantons, who lurked around the fort, and having found means to give intelligence of their capture to Sieur d'Orvilliers, the commandant, that officer sent proposals for a conference to the Indians, informing them that if they would send three of their men to the Prairie he would delegate as many. The Indians having consented, Sieur d'Orvilliers sent Father de Lamberville, the Jesuit, with two soldiers. This Father spoke to them first, and asked them why they were seizing our people since we were at war only with the Seneca. They answered, wherefore had we taken so many of their tribes; if we would restore them, they would give up our people. The

---

[39] "Je vous diray que Jay veu des Nouvelles certaines de M[r] de La Salle qui viennent de france que lon a aprises par Les Espagnols. Il a faict un fort dans le Nouueau Mithsy avec Les Sauvages qui habitent ces cartiers ainsy nous esperons Dieu aidant Le voir en peu Triomphant de ses entreprises," Jean Michaud to Miss d'Allonne, November 2, 1686; the letter is in the Otto L. Schmidt Collection of the Chicago Historical Society.

[40] Belmont, *Histoire du Canada*, published by the Quebec Literary and Historical Society, Series 1, No. 4, Quebec, 1840, 26. The Black Kettle, la Chaudière Noire, was a famous Onondaga chief, cf. E. B. O'Callaghan, ed., *Documents relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York* (NYCD), Albany, 1855, IX, 556, 681, 684; C. C. Le Roy, Sieur de Bacqueville de la Potherie, *Histoire de l'Amérique Septentrionale*, Amsterdam, 1723, III, 159-161.

[41] NYCD, III, 527, 529.

Father having stated that they were at Quebec and that notice of the present demands must needs be communicated to Onontio, they inquired respecting the condition of their men, and having been answered they were confined merely with a view to their safer detention, the Father presented them two belts to oblige them not to injure our prisoners, nor to take part with the Seneca. They received the belts, and went to rejoin Miss d'Allonne, but with faces so sad and so pensive that she thought they were going to dispatch her. She, however, suffered only fear, and was immediately conveyed, with the other two to Onondaga.[42]

Miss d'Allonne did not remain long in the Onondaga village. When Dongan heard that "a gentlewoman . . . taken at Caderachqui"[43] was prisoner there, he prevailed upon the Indians to bring her to Albany. She was at Albany when Father Vaillant came as Denonville's envoy in the hope of getting the intractable Dongan to alter conditions "which were for the most part such as honor did not permit us to accept."[44] These conditions were the return of the Indians entrapped at Fort Frontenac, because, said Dongan, they were British subjects; compensation for the plundering by the French of English traders on their way to Michilimackinac; the razing of Fort Niagara and Fort Frontenac. "The Jesuit played his part with ability, and proved more than a match for his adversary in dialectics, but Dongan held fast to all his demands,"[45] which wrote the governor of New York to Denonville, were "soe just and reasonable."[46]

In Albany, Miss d'Allonne was seconding the efforts of Father Vaillant after her own manner. Dongan having assembled the Indians, he told them of the embassy of the Jesuit and what it meant. The sachems left everything in the hands of their good friend Dongan.

After the propositions were over the Capt^ne^ of the Onnondages called Canadgegai, told his Excell: [*i. e.,* Dongan] that Madam Toulon who was taken at Cadarachqui meeting him upon the street, said shee was glad to see him and invited him to a house to give him bread and comeing in found father Valiant there, who was desyreous to discourse with him; what will you discourse says the Indian, doe you speak first, whereupon the Priest askd how it was with the five nations, and how they were inclined, what says the Capt^ne^ doe you ask me, how

[42] "Relation of the Events of the War, and State of the Affairs in Canada," NYCD, IX, 389.

[43] Dongan to Denonville, October 31, 1687, NYCD, III, 517.

[44] "Relation of the Events . . .," NYCD, IX, 389.

[45] Parkman, *Count Frontenac and New France under Louis* XIV, Boston, 1891, 162.

[46] Dongan to Denonville, February 17, 1688, NYCD, III, 519.

it is with them when you daily converse with his Excell: who is there head, I should rather ask you how affares goe, that hes been so long in agitation with him, to whom he referred all things, and whose commands we only will obey or do you intend to pump me.[47]

Vaillant and his party returned to Montreal in February 1688, bringing eight French prisoners to exchange for the eight Iroquois in French hands.[48] Miss de Roybon was not among them.[49] We learn from the anonymous account already quoted that "in the month of July 1688 deputies arrived at Montreal from Colonel Dongan, who brought back thirteen of our French people, among the rest Miss d'Allonne."[50]

Whether she stayed in Montreal or went back to Fort Frontenac is not known with certainty. More likely, she remained at Montreal, because, as she herself was to say in later years, when she was taken prisoner the Iroquois had burnt her house and robbed her of her possessions. It is asserted, it is true, that in July 1689, when Iroquois warriors lured Father Milet and a surgeon out of Fort Frontenac under the plea of helping a dying person,

> Miss d'Allonne, who was then at the fort, wanted to accompany them. So that the three of them went to the enemies' camp, whence they did not return to the fort. They took the surgeon with them to Lachine; he escaped as I said before, and they sent Miss d'Allonne to their villages after having much mishandled them.[51]

This text probably led M. de Bonnault to write that she was twice in the Iroquois country.[52] The author of the *Recueil,* apparently writing from memory, erroneously makes Miss d'Allonne a companion of Father Milet's captivity. No contemporary document relating Father Milet's capture makes mention of Miss d'Allonne. Apart from this lack of evidence, the statement in the *Recueil* seems incredible, for no sane person who had once suffered at the hands of the Iroquois, would out of mere curiosity

---

[47] "Answer of the Six Nations to Governor Dongan," February 13, 1688, NYCD, III, 535.

[48] Dongan to Denonville, February 17, 1688, NYCD, IX, III, 520.

[49] There seems to be an error in Belmont, *Histoire du Canada,* 28, where he has Miss d'Allonne returning to Montreal, March 30, 1688. See next note.

[50] "Relation of the Events . . .," NYCD, IX, 391. Cf. Denonville to Dongan, August 20, 1688, NYCD, III, 556, and 563.

[51] *Recueil de ce qui s'est passé en Canada au sujet de la guerre tant des Anglais que des Iroquois depuis l'année 1682,* published by the Literary and Historical Society of Quebec, Series 3, No. 2, Quebec, 1871, 25, also in *Collection de Manuscrits . . . relatifs à la Nouvelle France,* Quebec, 1884, I, 551. The author of the *Recueil* is said to be Gédéon de Catalogne.

[52] *Larousse mensuel,* X, (October 1935), 231.

wish to put herself in a position to renew the experience. Gédéon de Catalogne mixed up the date of her kidnaping at the beginning of August 1687—which he does not mention at all in narrating events of that year—with the capture of Milet at the beginning of August two years later.

Madeleine certainly was at Montreal in 1690 and lived there until her death in 1718. "On January 14, 1690, Mademoiselle de Roybon d'Allonne, age about 44, bought from the Sieur Jean Vincent Philippe de Hautmesnil, a plot of ground 60 x 115 feet on St. Vincent Street, Montreal."[53] On this spot she pledged she would build two houses. In 1701 she authorized Charles de Couagne, a merchant of Montreal, and Sieur Dufresne to sell one of her houses. When she learned that her agents would remit to her 600 livres, while they were being paid 750, she protested.

M. Massicotte tells the story as he found it in the court records of Montreal and passes to the main part of his article. The agents had things their way, but Miss de Roybon was not so easily disposed of. She appealed the case to the Sovereign Council of Quebec. The registers of this court merely have: "Magdeleine de Roibon Dalonne, porté au long au plumitif."[54] However, a woman of her mettle, trained in the wilderness, and once a prisoner of the fierce Iroquois, was not to be overawed by real estate agents. She seems to have secured an ordinance in Montreal, September 3, 1701, upholding her rights. From the Quebec court records this ordinance appears to have allowed *her* to sell a house to the highest bidder "and with the proceeds to pay what she owes to said de Couagne." Said Couagne and his partner were forbidden "to trouble aforesaid Miss until said house and appurtenances be sold." It was Couagne's turn to appeal to Quebec. Miss d'Allonne, bent on fighting her own battles, retained no lawyer in Quebec, but went thither herself, and availed herself of the services of the court crier only. Promptly upon her arrival she entered a protest with the court, asking that Couagne pay all her expenses from Montreal to Quebec and return. Here is the verdict:

> Was said by the [Sovereign] Council that the appeal [of Couagne] was in order, while the ordinance [of Montreal] was not, hence the said Council did and does condemn said Miss d'Allonne to pay to said de Couagne within a month from this day, the sum of 323 livres 9 *sols* 6 *deniers* she still owes him, else and failing which and the delay

[53] E. Z. Massicotte, "Un fait divers d'autrefois," in *Bulletin des Recherches historiques*, XXV, 1919, 277.

[54] *Jugements et délibérations*, IV, 591, 592.

elapsed, aforesaid Couagne is allowed to sue, and said Miss d'Allonne is hereby condemned to costs and her claims for expenses against de Couagne nonsuited.[55]

Three years later Miss de Roybon was in the news. She played a leading part in an episode which has all the earmarks of a plot in a mystery story. The episode, aptly labelled "un fait divers" by M. Massicotte, is here set down from his version based on the judicial records of Montreal:

At 1.00 a. m., Wednesday, June 3, 1705, a man whom Miss de Roybon did not know, "a layman as far as it seemed" and "carrying neither light nor candle" knocked at her door and handed over to her a newly born child. The mysterious messenger told her that the child had only been privately baptized [ondoyé] and that she must have him baptized in the church [baptisé] as soon as possible. He recommended to take good care of the child assuring her she would be well paid. There and then he gave her a sum of money which she omitted to count. Finally he told her the names of a few nurses and made her promise to keep the secret. Either willingly or from fear, she accepted the child. The following day she looked for a nurse. She chose Suzanne Jousset whom she called "la Joussette" and sent her to have the child baptized in the church.

Abbé Yves Priat was then the parish priest of Montreal. He refused to baptize the child before knowing who had baptized it privately. Miss de Roybon contended that she did not know. Brought before the judge, she told under oath what we have just narrated, adding that it was all she knew.

Did the parish priest solve the mystery, or did he realize that it was insoluble? Be that as it may, a few days later he wrote the following entry in the baptismal register: "On June 14, 1705, was baptized Louis, son of an unknown father and of an unknown mother. The godfather, Louis Moriceau, and the godmother Susanne Jousset . . . declared they could not sign their name. Priat, ptre."[56]

When twelve years later she made her last will, there is no mention of the child. "Did she bring him up? Did she know his parents? Until other investigators find definite information, these questions must be answered by fiction writers." M. Massicotte wrote these words twenty years ago, the mystery of Miss de Roybon's nocturnal adventure is still unsolved.

After the foundling episode, Miss d'Allonne's name reappears twice in the records. The first time, in a petition signed by her to Raudot, the intendant of New France, wherein details about

---

[55] *Ibid.*, 710-711.
[56] *Bulletin des Recherches Historiques*, XXV, 1919, 278.

the land grants given her by La Salle a quarter of a century before are found, and a last reference to the money she gave to the explorer, and the second time, when she made her will.

To my Lord the Intendant:

Demoiselle Magdeleine de Roybon d'Allonne humbly begs and sets forth that, having gone to considerable expense and given all her attention to the first establishment of Fort Frontenac, Monsieur de la Salle, then seignior and governor of the said place, in consideration of her efforts and the great establishment she had made, granted her a tract of land, two leagues front by one in depth [seven square miles] in fief and seigniory, from the Tioneguinon River toward *l'Ance au Baril*.[57] On this seigniory she had considerable work done as well as on four [other] *habitations* which she acquired near the said fort. She would not have abandoned the seigniory but for the war with the Iroquois, whose frequent incursions drove the settlers out of those parts, and who took said petitioner prisoner after burning her house, ravaging her wheat fields, killing her cattle, and stealing her merchandise.

When the revenue contracts of Canada changed hands and were given to the burghers and inhabitants thereof, the goods belonging to the said late Sieur de la Salle were seized, although His Majesty only allowed the new revenue contractors to seize them on condition that they pay his debts. They have not done so. The said Demoiselle has not been paid some 2,000 livres, the note for which she produced as required by the Crown and in compliance with the order of M. de Callières, then Governor general. After the peace [1701], she asked permission to go to Fort Frontenac. She had already set out with the intention of settling anew on her establishment, when she was dissuaded and prevented from going, and the merchandise she was bringing with her was seized. This was done by the gentlemen directors of the Company, who used the authority of M. the Governor [Vaudreuil]. In her present fear and just apprehension, she has recourse to you [Raudot].

Therefore, my Lord, in consideration of the herewith enclosed titles to the land in question, may it please you to order the said Sieurs directors to appear before you and give reason why they oppose her

---

[57] See the map in Margry, II, frontispiece. East of Cataracouy is a small bay legended *Toneguignon*, but the *Ance au Baril* is not shown. Noticable is the *Pte a la Dolone* near the fort. Was this point named after Miss d'Allonne? Is *Dolone* a corruption of her name? Dongan uses this form in NYCD, III, 529. The Governor of New York, it is true, was not very particular about the spelling of French proper names—no more than the French themselves were at that time, even about their own name, cf. J.-E. Roy, "Le Baron de Lahontan," in *Proceedings and Transactions* of the Royal Society in Canada, Series 1, XII, 1894, Section 1, 120—but in this case Dongan is answering a paper handed to him by Father Vaillant and his English interpreter where the same form, *Dolone*, occurs, NYCD, III, 527.

establishment at the said Tioneguinion River, and be sentenced to restore all they have seized, and be forbidden from preventing her and troubling her in the said place, so that justice be done her.

(signed) M. de Roybon Dallonne.[58]

At the foot of the page is Raudot's order to the Directors to appear before him. What the outcome was is unknown. It was probably pigeonholed, since the men involved were all-powerful in the colony. Madeleine was then sixty years old. Ten years later she made her last will. She asked to be buried, as it is customary, with the poor people. Her house in Montreal is to be sold. The proceeds are to be distributed to various women friends, to the poor, and to the church of the Recollects. The proceeds from the sale of movables and utensils should be given so as to have prayers said for the repose of her soul. One item refers to her days in France. "Ditto, declares that 50 years ago, in France, she pledged herself for 75 livres, French money, and she does not know whether this debt was paid or what became of the creditor. At any rate, the executor of the present last will will kindly consult several casuists about this."[59] "Fifty years ago" brings us back to 1667, the year La Salle came to Canada, a mere coincidence, no doubt.

On January 8, 1718, deeming her end near, she repaired to Adhémar, the notary of Montreal, and made several changes in her will. A week later, another will with slight alterations was drawn. Instead of having Etienne de Radisson as executor, she now appointed Mme. La Source, "her good friend, executrix, and revoked all other wills, codicils, which she made in the past or might make in the future in which the following words are not found *Credidi propter quod.*" Miss d'Allonne did not change her third testament. She died two days later, January 17, 1718.[60] She was 72 years old.

The recital of the available evidence explains the question mark in the title of this sketch. If Madeleine de Roybon d'Allonne was the girl whom La Salle at one time may have considered marrying, no positive proof has thus far come to light. In the autograph extant papers of the explorer, her name appears only

---

[58] The document is in the Otto L. Schmidt Collection of the Chicago Historical Society.

[59] E. Z. Massicotte, "Les Testaments de Mlle de Roybon d'Allonne," in *Bulletin des Recherches Historiques,* XXVIII, 1922, 95.

[60] Cf. Tanguay, *Dictionnaire généalogique,* III, 356, gives 1646 as the date of her birth; the act of January 14, 1690, *Bulletin des Recherches Historiques,* XXV, 1925, 277, gives her age "about 44." She was three years younger than La Salle.

once, in the Quebec note of 1683. Had she been mentioned by name in the La Salle letter spoken of by Parkman, which Margry said he possessed, it is unlikely that Margry would have withheld the name from Parkman, even though at the time Margry had been unwililng to communicate the letter itself. Later, when Margry published the La Salle papers, he did not produce any letter in which the explorer spoke of "a damsel of good connections in the colony," whom he intended to marry at the time when he was thwarted by Abbé Jean Cavelier. The suspicion is that Margry was merely leading Parkman on. As the matter now stands, such a letter of La Salle wherein he would speak of a damsel would either confirm or disprove the circumstantial evidence recited above. At any rate it would erase the question mark in the title of this article, and Miss de Roybon d'Allonne, because of her place in La Salle's affections, would become a more important historical character.

JEAN DELANGLEZ

# Notes and Comment

## JAMES ALEXANDER ROBERTSON

James Alexander Robertson, distinguished friend and honored colleague of historians, bibliographers, and archivists, died at Annapolis on March 30, 1939.

He was born at Corry, Pennsylvania, on August 19, 1873, of Scottish ancestry. In 1896, he was graduated from Adalbert College, Western Reserve University, with the degree of Ph. B., and immediately began a career, which, though varied, always associated itself with books and with history, latterly with Latin American history.

Unlike many of his generation, he was not trained in the methods of research by formal graduate studies, but by the pursuit of practical ends. Immediately upon leaving college, he joined the editorial staff of the *Jesuit Relations*. Perhaps it was the habit of system and industry derived from six years' discipline here, which enabled him so light-heartedly to begin and carry through to completion so many pieces of work. Before the *Jesuit Relations* were finished, he had embarked, in collaboration with Miss Emma Blair, upon a project for publishing in translation the documentary records of the Philippine Islands. Seven years, from 1902 to 1909, were spent in collecting this material in the libraries and archives of Spain, Portugal, France, Italy, England, and the United States. The results were fifty-five volumes, carefully edited and translated, *The Philippine Islands, 1493-1898*. In recognition of this accomplishment, Western Reserve University conferred upon Mr. Robertson the degree of L. H. D. in 1906. In these ten years after finishing college, Dr. Robertson had not only carried to completion the colossal work on the Philippine Islands, but he had also prepared and published *Magellan's Voyage around the World*, by Antonio Pigafetta in three volumes and had ready for the press his Morga's *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas*, which was published in 1907, and a *Bibliography of the Philippine Islands*, published in 1908. These were but an indication of what was to follow, for during his whole life, he continued to write, translate, and edit at a prodigious rate.

In 1909, Dr. Robertson joined the staff of the historical research department of the Carnegie Institution. He left this to go to the Philippine Islands in 1910, as librarian of the Philippine Library at Manila. He remained in that position until 1916, and during that time negotiated for the Philippine Government the purchase of a large and important collection of documents from the Compañia General de Tabacos de Filipinas at Barcelona.

From the Philippines, Dr. Robertson returned to America to resume work with the Carnegie Institution, but the next year was appointed chief of the Research Division of the Bureau of Foreign

and Domestic Commerce. This office he held until 1923 when he reentered academic life as research professor of American history at the John B. Stetson University. For the ten following years he devoted himself to research, publication, and editorial work for the Florida Historical Society. The volumes published during his editorship show the great activity of the society under his leadership. From 1935, he was archivist of the Hall of Records, Annapolis, Maryland.

This record of Dr. Robertson's successive official titles represents but one side of his career. His less formal institutional connections are equally important. For many years Dr. Robertson was continuously active in the organization and administration of various cooperative historical enterprises. Only a few of these may be mentioned here. In 1916 he helped to found the *Hispanic American Historical Review* and from 1918 until his death was its editor. Later he was the moving spirit in establishing both the Society of American Archivists, and the Inter-American Bibliographical and Library Association. In connection with the latter he assumed additional editorial responsibilities.

The number of publications in which Dr. Robertson participated seem legion. Even to enumerate all of his own works would be such a formidable bibliographical task that none are here listed. And at the time of his death, he had several volumes ready for the press and work in progress, which, it is hoped, may be finished by others. He had also collected an unusually fine private library, which included a vast collection of Filipiniana such as only the skill of a professional scholar could have brought together.

Few men have undertaken so much as James Alexander Robertson and few men have accomplished their tasks so well, and at the same time, generously offered their assistance and friendship to their colleagues. And possibly Dr. Robertson's greatest achievement, after all, was personal and one which can never be recorded: throughout his life he was unsparing of his time and his energy in inspiring, advising, and assisting other historical students, and in particular those at the beginning of their careers. In this our loss is irreparable.

RUTH LAPHAM BUTLER

## FOR BRAZILIAN STUDIES

At the Conference on Bibliography and Concentration of Research Materials in the Field of Latin American Studies, held at Ann Arbor, last July 21 and 22, one of the morning sessions was devoted to the development of Brazilian studies. The discussion opened with considerable emphasis upon the linguistic difficulties in this field for English-speaking students, due, in the first place to the lack of courses in Portuguese in nearly all college curricula, and, in the second place, to the need for books, dictionaries, grammars, and readers for beginning students. For the English-speaking student there are two or

three Portuguese grammars; such a dictionary as Michaelis (which does not represent the Brazilian vocabulary) is, of course, adequate, but the cost is prohibitive. For the student of Brazilian Portuguese, all of these difficulties are further magnified. Owing to the differences between Portuguese and Brazilian, there is a real need for special vocabularies of the language. The best dictionary for this is doubtless that of Carlos Teschauer, *Novo diccionario nacional,* Porto Alegere, 1928; another, more difficult to use, is by Plinio M. da Silva Ayrosa, *Diccionario portuguez-brasiliano e brasiliano-portuguez,* São Paulo, 1934. Beyond these, there are many aids, to be found, however, only in the larger libraries or in collections which specialize in Latin American studies. The Edward E. Ayer Collection of the Newberry Library has in preparation a checklist of linguistic items of all Indian dialects of the Americas there available. As one of the by-products of this compilation, a short list of periodical articles, including glossaries, vocabularies, and grammars of the Brazilian language has been collected. The list is not exhaustive, but it does contain certain important fugitive material upon this subject. These are as follows:

Ayrosa, Plinio M. da Silva, *ed.*
Diccionario Portuguez e Brasiliano obra necessaria aos ministros do Altar . . . Lisboa, 1795.
In: Revista do Museu Paulista, v. 18 (1934), pp. 17-322.

Ayrosa, Plinio M. da Silva
Termos Tupís no Português do Brasil. São Paulo, 1937.

Diccionario Brazileiro da lingua Portugueza . . .
In: Annaes da Bibliotheca Nacional do Rio de Janeiro, v. 13 (1889), 145 pp.

Escragnolle Taunay, Affonso d'
Lexico de termos vulgares, correntes no Brasil, sobretudo no Estado de São Paulo, e de accepções de numerosos vocabulos, ainda não apontodos nos grandes diccionarios da lingua portugueza e colleccionados por Affonso d' Escragnolle Taunay.
In: Revista do Inst. Hist. e Geog. de São Paulo, v. 16 (1914), pp. 7-223.

Figueira, P. Luiz
Grammatica da lingua do Brasil composta pelo P. Luiz Figueira. Novamente publicado por Julio Platzmann. Leipzig, 1878.

Garcia, Rodolpho
Diccionario de brasileirismos (Peculiaridades pernambucanas).
In: Revista do Inst. Hist. e Geog. Brasileiro, v. 76 (1915), pp. 633-947.

Nimuendajú, Curt
Idiomas indígenas del Brasil.
In: Revista del Instituto de Etnologia de la Universidad Nacional de Tucumán, v. 2 (1931), pp. 543-618.

d'Oliveira, Brigadeiro Machado
Brasileirismos.

In: Revista do Arquivo municipal, v. 24 (1936), pp. 119-130.

d'Oliveira, J. J. Machado

Vocabulario elementar da lingua geral Brasilica.

In: Revista do Arquivo Municipal, v. 25 (1936), pp. 129-174.

Platzmann, Julius

Grammatik der Brasilianischen Sprache, mit Zugrundelegung des Anchieta, herausgegeben von Julius Platzmann. Leipzig, 1874.

Prazeres Maranhão, Francisco de

Collecção de etymologias Brazilicas.

In: Revista trimensal de historia e geographia ou Jornal do Instituto historico e geographico Brazileiro, 2d ser., v. 8 (1846), pp. 69-81.

Sampaio, Theodoro

Da evolução historica do vocabulario geographico no Brazil.

In: Revista do Inst. Hist. e Geog. de São Paulo, v. 8 (1903), pp. 150-169.

Souza, Bernardino José de

Onomastica geral da geographia Brasileira.

In: Revista do Inst. Geog. e Hist. da Bahia, No. 53 (1927), 319 pp.

Teschauer, Carlos

Porandúba Riograndense. Porto Alegre, 1929.

Valle Cabral, A. do

Etymologicas Brazilicas.

In: Annaes da Bibliotheca Nacional do Rio de Janeiro, v. 2 (1877), pp. 201-204, 404-406.

Vocabulario Geographico Brasilico

In: Revista do Inst. Geog. e Hist. da Bahia, No. 54 (1928), pp. 191-400.

RUTH LAPHAM BUTLER

## A PICTORIAL HISTORY OF PRAIRIE DU CHIEN

It was not long ago that artists condoned anachronisms in their work. That he had depicted Champlain, founder of New France, in the armor of a medieval knight, did not at all perturb the painter of a past century. In a picture familiar to all Americans, Washington crosses the Delaware under the Stars and Stripes, a banner which came into use some time later. The dying Wolfe of Benjamin West, as Professor H. J. McAuliffe points out in a recent article, is surrounded by a group of men, some of whom were not present at his death; one or two, in fact, were not even in the battle on the Plains of Abraham.

At long last, however, historical research is becoming a tool in the hands of the artist, if we may judge from the work of Mr. Calvin Peters, who is at present engaged in putting on canvas the history of the old fur-trading center of the Northwest, Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin.

Although Prairie du Chien is a place of little importance today, its

pristine greatness appears in a statement of Dr. Louise P. Kellogg, found in the Introduction of P. L. Scanlan's *Prairie du Chien:*

"Because of its commanding position on the Mississippi at the mouth of the Wisconsin, Prairie du Chien's history is involved in international relations. After France's cession of Western Louisiana to Spain in 1762 and the revolt of the English colonies that had far echoes in that distant region, Prairie du Chien stood at the meeting place of three great nations, while American, British, and Spanish agents vied for the allegiance of the upper Mississippi Indians, and the riches that came from their trade."

Here it was that Marquette and Jolliet first looked on the broad Mississippi; here a great fur trade developed; here Black Hawk was turned over to Zachary Taylor, after his defeat at Bad Axe. These are but a few of the incidents that Mr. Peters is depicting on canvas.

In how many paintings of Father Marquette's discovery of the Mississippi do Indians accompany him! Yet at this stage of the journey, he numbered no Indians among his companions. Two Miamis had accompanied him for a short time before he reached the Wisconsin, but had left him when he entered that stream, as he narrates it in the *Jesuit Relations* (59, 105-107). And so in Mr. Peter's painting, we see Marquette, Jolliet, and two Frenchmen in the first canoe and three other Frenchmen in the second. The two leaders of the expedition appear to be discussing the discovery. Dr. Scanlan tells us that Jolliet and Marquette set out in separate canoes; but it is not at all improbable that both should be in the first canoe as they approached the great river.

The second painting shows a group of French-Canadian traders bartering with Indians—Chippewas, from the woods of Wisconsin, whose loaf-shaped huts squat in the right background, and Sioux from the north and west, whose tepees cover the left side of the picture. The village of Prairie du Chien was the center of the fur trade in the upper Mississippi Valley. Through the influence of Colonel Robert Dickson, superintendent of the Indian Affairs in the Northwest for the British, it became a neutral ground for the Indians where no war could be fought (Wisconsin Historical Collections, X, 213).

"The Capture of Fort Shelby by the British" entailed the greatest amount of research on the part of the painter, especially to ascertain the type of uniform worn by the British officers and men, and to discover the exact shape and size of the fortification. The Americans began Fort Shelby in June 1814, and completed it the following month, while, at the same time, the British at Mackinac prepared to march on Prairie du Chien. Under the command of William McKay, an army of six hundred and fifty, of whom one hundred and twenty were white men, chiefly of the regiment of Michigan Fencibles, attacked Fort Shelby. The Americans, seeing the hopelessness of their position, capitulated. The artist shows Colonel McKay encouraging a motley group of Fencibles, Canadians, Sauks, and Sioux, who surround the

lone cannon, which was ably manned by James Keating, a gunner of the Royal Artillery.

Peace came soon after and the British reluctantly left Prairie du Chien. American troops arrived June 20, 1816, and Colonel William Sutherland Hamilton began the erection of a new fort, to be known as the Log Fort Crawford. This is the scene depicted in the next painting.

The other completed work is one of great interest. Black Hawk, valiant leader of the vanquished Sauks, stands a captive before Colonel Zachary Taylor, commander of the second Fort Crawford. In the doorway behind the colonel is Lieutenant Jefferson Davis, who later escorted the prisoner and his companion, The Prophet, to Jefferson Barracks. Chetar, and the one-eyed Decorah, captors of the Sauk chieftain, sullenly stand guard.

The surrender is significant in American history. It ended the last attempt of the redmen to forstall the advance of the whites in the old Northwest Territory. After this, the tide of white settlements rolled relentlessly westward.

Three more paintings will complete the series: the Capture of Red Bird, leader of the Winnebago uprising of 1827, who died in one of the dungeons of the original Fort Crawford; the erection of the second Fort Crawford; and lastly, the Massacre of the Bad Axe, in which Black Hawk's people fell before the onslaught of the whites and their Indian allies. The scene of this battle is fifty miles north of Prairie du Chien and is the only painting that does not depict an incident that actually took place near the village.

The progression of the artist is, as may have been noticed, not chronological. These three incidents occurred before the surrender of Black Hawk (1832). The capitulation of that chieftain, marking as it does the end of an epoch in the history of the old Northwest Territory, forms a fitting close to the series of historical paintings.

Historians cannot but be pleased with such work. An accurate history of a section of America appears on the walls of the museum. The artist has shown what an excellent historical source painting can become.

W. B. FAHERTY

## A MISTAKE

The last July number of MID-AMERICA, in the section captioned Documents, published "Tonti Lettters." The name of Jean Delanglez, who wrote the introduction and edited and translated the letters, was unfortunately omitted, and the mistake was not discovered until the edition was in the mail. The usual investigation procedure was promptly inaugurated with the usual unhappy results for the editor—who offers all apologies.

# Book Reviews

*The Enigma of James II.* By Malcolm V. Hay. London, Sands and Company, 1938. Pp. xvi + 243.

Of the pivotal years in English history, 1671 is one of the most important. In that year, James, Duke of York, brother and heir of Charles II, became a Catholic. The momentous interplay of political forces that followed, up to the "glorious revolution" of 1688, which put William of Orange on the throne of England, all centered about that essential fact of James' conversion to the Catholic faith.

James was then about thirty-eight years old. He had proven his skill and courage in wars. He was popular, even with a Parliament that had no great love for the Stuarts. After the restoration of Charles II in 1660, James reorganized and commanded the English navy, with a resolute foresight and personal gallantry that won him enthusiastic acclaim. But by becoming a Catholic he committed the unpardonable sin. Parliament, which in 1665 had voted him a grant of £120,000, eight years later passed the Test Act, excluding him and all other Catholics from public office. Charles, against his inclinations and his principles, signed the Test Act. He did so through fear of a dominant majority, made up in part of sincere Protestant fanatics, who believed that to tolerate the Catholic minority (of a percentage probably about equal to that of the Catholics in the United States today) would be to destroy Protestantism in England, and in part of greedy politicians and their hangers-on who dreaded that a resurgent Catholicism might make them disgorge their loot of ecclesiastical property.

James hated intolerance, and was stubborn in his purpose to free both the dissenters and the Catholics from the persecuting laws. He carried out a policy of religious toleration in his colony of New York, sanctioning the practice of toleration by Governor Andros in 1674 and the formal charter of religious liberty under the Catholic governor, Thomas Dongan, in 1683.

One reply to that attitude of James was the villainous Titus Oates Plot of 1679, and the consequent attempt by Parliament to debar James from the succession. But Charles stood firm against this new attack. Charles died in February 1685, a Catholic on his death-bed, and James at once succeeded him, the last king of England to make public profession of the Catholic faith. (Even if it be true, as reported on good authority, that Edward VII, like Charles II, died a Catholic, his was a private, not a public, profession of the Catholic religion.) Two years later, James II proclaimed, as his brother had done before him, a "Declaration of Indulgence," granting freedom of conscience even to the Catholics whom Charles had not included in his Declaration.

Then began the campaign of calumny against James, which was to continue down to our own day, and was to create what Major Hay had called "the enigma" of James II. From Gilbert Burnet in James' own time to Winston Churchill in ours, James' enemies have succeeded in having this man of demonstrated courage scorned as a coward, this generous and open man labeled a hypocrite, this man who endured so much in his efforts for religious toleration branded as savagely intolerant. A tradition of historical falsehood was to be built up, so strong as to deceive even Lingard. Historian after historian, Macaulay, Lecky, Buckle, Bagehot, Fortescue, Gwatkin, Trevelyan, Fisher, Winston Churchill, and many others, passed on the ancient lies. Nor is it, after Lingard, astonishing that lesser Catholic historians came to accept unquestioningly the historical slanders, and to berate James II as having brought upon his fellow-Catholics "the hatred inspired by the perfidy, cruelty, and tyranny of the absconded sovereign" (W. S. Lilly, in article "England," *Catholic Encyclopedia,* V, 452b).

Here and there a voice was raised in protest against this perpetuated calumny. Isolated and detailed studies of the Titus Oates Plot, of "the Bloody Assizes," and the like, showed the bias and distortion upon which the charges against James were built. In 1928, Mr. Hilaire Belloc, in his *James the Second,* a brilliant analysis of James' character and of the complex situation he had to face, refuted many of the lies about him. But Mr. Belloc, excellent historian though he is, chooses not to do reverence to the mechanics and apparatus of scholarship nowadays often more highly prized than historical truth itself, and hence is anathema to the pundits. Mr. Belloc could convert only those who needed no conversion.

What Major Hay has done in *The Enigma of James II* is to take up the central accusations against James, his cruelty, his fanatical intolerance, his hypocrisy, his cowardice, his tyranny, dissect out the sources of these accusations, and confront them with indisputable evidence to show their falsity. He has worked directly from the contemporary documents, patiently, measuredly, keeping his temper in the midst of infuriating dishonesty and smug pre-judging. He gives chapter and verse for every authority quoted. He lists six pages of sources in his bibliography. He quotes *in extenso* the documents which have been garbled. In a word, he observes all the niceties of historical presentation, all the punctilio of citation, which Mr. Belloc refuses to observe. His manner is more considerate of the fashion in historical writing than is Mr. Belloc's; but the conclusions of both are exactly the same.

Major Hay does not claim to solve completely the enigma of James II. His view of James is not as comprehensive as Mr. Belloc's. Yet both let us see that it is not alone the bigotry of James' critics which makes him a puzzling figure. James was intelligent; but, as Mr. Belloc says, "he thought in straight lines"; he could not scheme against schemers. He let himself be duped, by Sunderland, by Shaftsbury, by Churchill,

even by the meanly treacherous William of Orange. He seemed incapable of believing in treachery; he pardoned the traitors, and continued to trust them. Up to the very end he dealt affectionately with William and with his strange daughters, Mary and Anne, through all their lying and plotting against him. Was it only the sudden realization of how horribly he had been duped that made him, after a lifetime of courageous effort, drop his hands in despair when William invaded England?

One wonders whether or not *The Enigma of James II* will clear his name of the scorn heaped upon it for centuries. False history has an amazing tenacity of life. Armored in emotional obsessions it seems impervious to reason. It makes its own "proofs"; it recognizes no others. Refutations seem to have little or no effect upon it. For all those who are not quite blinded by prejudice, Major Hay's fine book must shatter the ugly legends about James II. But for how many more must there remain forever a greater enigma than that of James, the enigma of the vitality of falsehood?

W. KANE

Loyola University

*A Short History of the Americas.* By R. S. Cotterill, Ph. D. New York, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1939. Pp. xv + 459. Maps.

The last eighteen months have been fruitful in Latin American studies and publications. To pass over congresses, conferences, and meetings organized in order to promote mutual understanding and good will, there lies before this reviewer four different texts which have appeared in 1938 and the first half of 1939, namely, D. R. Moore's, F. A. Kirkpatrick's, Tom B. Jones's, and finally Cotterill's *A Short History of the Americas.*

This work was an ambitious undertaking, for it surveys the history of the Western Hemisphere from the coming of Columbus to the latest developments of 1938 and 1939. To do this in one volume of moderate size, for the two Americas both for the colonial and national periods, meant that the problem of composition would be one of relatime emphasis and distribution. In this reviewer's opinion the subject has been vigorously tackled and successfully solved. Of necessity many stories are briefly told, as that of Cortés for instance and Pizarro, but the general distribution and the equalization of emphasis seems excellent indeed.

Most often and quite naturally the one who writes a book knows more about the subject than the one who reviews it. But in a work which covers as wide a field as this the reviewer may be able to pick out a corner or a section in which he happens to possess some more specialized information. Here is a good testing point for the exactitude of the author. The present work passes well the test. The mission both as a frontier institution and as a benevolent means of civilizing the

Indian is here clearly sketched. The vigorous and deep indentation west of the Tordesillas line of 1494, an indentation made by the Portuguese, became possible through the advance of the missionaries up the Amazon and its tributaries. Following the Black Robe came the soldier and clinched the territory for Portugal. Anyone acquainted with mission history in the Americas will appreciate the following: "The mission station was the advance agent of Spanish authority—occasionally so far in advance that authority could not follow" (104).

The author builds up well and comprehensively the background of the discovery of America, possibly diminishing a bit too much the importance of Columbus. It is refreshing to have him remark on the exaggerated descriptions on the part of certain authors of the Maya and Aztec civilizations. He points out clearly their barbaric spots and stains, the human sacrifices, lack of alphabet, and the rest. Since in chapter seven, entitled "Slaves and Furs" he deals with Spanish expansion in the Southwest and mentions the Jesuit missions of the west coast he might well have included in his bibliography for this chapter Herbert E. Bolton's *The Spanish Borderlands*.

There are some good maps, good illustrations of old maps, and appended to each chapter a selective bibliography with evaluating comments. This book is a solid contribution to the historical literature of the subject which it covers.

PETER M. DUNNE

University of San Francisco

*George III and William Pitt, 1783-1806*. By Donald Grove Barnes. Stanford University, California, Stanford University Press, 1939. Pp. xiii+512.

This book will provoke much discussion for it is revisionist history with findings at variance with the views of most scholars here and abroad. Indeed it is not too much to say that the author was not a little surprised at the conclusions forced on him by the evidence. For he tells us that in accepting the view that Pitt established modern cabinet government on the ruins of the king's personal government so that cabinet government might be said to have begun with the long ministry of 1783 to 1801 he merely set himself the task of tracing the steps in this change. But intensive study of the period, particularly of the unpublished correspondence of the two chief characters, soon raised a doubt as to the correctness of this assumption. In the end this suspicion gave place to the belief that this generally accepted view did not accord either with the facts or with the opinions entertained by King George and Pitt. Wherefore he concludes "the commonly accepted thesis that 1783 marked the beginning of the decline of the royal power must be dismissed as a myth" (476).

At the outset Dr. Barnes disclaims any intention to whitewash George or to blacken Pitt. If the contrast between these two person-

alities is sharply drawn there is no undue stressing of the strong points or glossing over of the weaknesses of either. Throughout the period under discussion George grew ever more convinced of a threefold implication of his prerogative: the right to choose his own ministers, to veto laws, to prevent the introduction as a government measure of what he disapproved. In his battle he was aided by dissension among the Whigs and by their serious mistakes, no less than by turning their own tactics against them. Setbacks there were, but they were temporary, and George's remarkable persistence prevailed. In 1801 he was as strong and as independent as in 1783.

Early in his career Pitt showed his colors when he refused to resign although hounded by the opposition after the defeat of important measures. Of special interest is the account of Pitt's career as a reformer. Undeserved praise has been accorded him. The fact is that at the beginning he was an ardent champion of reform despite royal disapproval; for a while he was satisfied with a sort of compromise to the effect that he might introduce and support reforms as personal, not government, measures; in the end his ardor cooled to such a degree that he adopted the 'time-not-ripe' policy. In short, he was no true reformer.

Dr. Barnes insists that Pitt proved himself no war minister, and that he made his own the dictum of his famous father: "men not measures." To his way of thinking there was only one man, himself, fully qualified by ability and family connections to wield supreme power. With such a conviction Pitt could not be a believer in political parties or party government. Nor was he the founder of the Tory party. "In many respects," writes Dr. Barnes, "the honor of being one of the patron saints of the Tory party is the strangest of all achievements which have been thrust upon Pitt" (489), because "to his dying day Pitt seems to have thought of himself as a Whig" (489).

Dr. Barnes has produced an excellent study of a period of the greatest importance in the political and constitutional history of England. It enriches history, it marks progress, and gives evidence of ripe scholarship; it is impartial, convincing, carefully documented, and written in an easy style. The publishers have contributed to the success of the undertaking, but it would appear that some publishers of books with whose views Dr. Barnes disagrees have refused permission to quote the passages from which he dissents. Thus is the path of the scholar beset with obstacles.

CHARLES H. METZGER

West Baden College

*America in Midpassage*. By Charles A. Beard and Mary R. Beard. New York, Macmillan Company, 1939. Pp. 977. Illustrated.

The historical views of the distinguished authors of *America in Midpassage* are no secret to the American public and the scholarly

fraternity. The same may be said of the speed and clarity of their style. And so when they write out their views on the Rooseveltian New Deal they will command a wide and attentive audience.

Mr. Beard once put down his *credo* in a notable essay called "That Noble Dream," which he printed in the *American Historical Review* in October 1935. He rejects the dogmatism of those who contend that they can produce a picture of history "exactly as it happened." In his incisive criticism the older Von Ranke ideal is dealt a withering blow. All the truth cannot be found with certitude, nor can any individual portray the complete story of any sizable episode. Following up this thought he urges his right to offer his partial interpretation of the human past, in his characteristic emphasis on the economic factors that condition the actions of men, parties, and nations.

The volume under review is in consonance with this reasonable position. It is a frank attack on the problem of our past fifteen years from the economic approach. It is outspokenly interpretative, very much so, and one might almost call it special pleading were he misled by the frequent castigation of the "Lords of Creation" and the not infrequent use of the collectivist measuring stick.

Such a view, however, would be unfair to the apparent honesty and deep disinterestedness of the authorship. The book is a sincere effort to diagnose the ailments of America in her time of current trial. The story is, for more than half of its length, occupied with government and the causes of our newer constitutional attitudes. Appended in four hundred pages is an account of manners, arts, entertainment, social and scientific thought.

Contemporary history, no matter how skillfully done, can never receive full approval. The perspective needed for wisdom is necessarily lacking. Objectivity of appraisal is scarcely possible. Error due to abundance of detail is unavoidable. Thus qualified, the reviewer urges attention to *America in Midpassage*.

W. EUGENE SHIELS

Loyola University

*Final Report of the United States De Soto Expedition Commission.* 76th Congress, 1st Session, House Document No. 71. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1939. Pp. xvi+400.

In 1936 an act was passed by Congress authorizing the President of the United States to appoint a commission to make a thorough study of Hernando de Soto's expedition into the wilds of North America, in order that the four-hundredth anniversary of that event, occurring in 1939, might be observed with suitable celebrations. The President appointed the following as members of the Commission: Hon. W. G. Brorein, Miss Caroline Dormon, Col. John R. Fordyce, Mr. V. Birney Imes, Mr. Andrew O. Holmes, Dr. Walter B. Jones, and Dr. John R. Swanton, chairman. On the death of Hon. W. G. Brorein, Mr. Carl D.

Brorein was appointed to fill the vacancy. The interest of most of these members in the De Soto expedition problems antedated by many years their appointment to the Commission. Perhaps most noteworthy are the efforts of Dr. John R. Swanton of the Smithsonian Institution. During the past twenty years his persistent research has determined various facts concerning the expedition.

Three years of intensive study in the archives of Spain and America and in the field have resulted in the publication of this final report, which "does not profess finality in the sense that the exact line of march pursued by De Soto and Moscoso has not been established for all time," but which is presented in such detail that it will be an invaluable aid to those who seek information concerning any phase of the expedition or of the country through which it passed. However, indisputable finality about the route of De Soto will never be attained, for records and documents are relatively few, and differ in many details. In this report there is an adequate discussion of these records of the expedition, giving the comparative value of each and the various editions and translations through which each has passed. Previous attempts to locate De Soto's route are taken up in detail, and the discussion of these covers thirty-five pages.

To ethnologists, the chapter on the Indians encountered by De Soto will be of special interest, for an attempt is made to identify the various tribes and villages met by the expedition, as well as a list of Indian words found in the narratives, with their possible origins. Before discussing the details of the journey, the Commission has given us the background of the organization and personnel of the expedition, including a sketch of the early life of Hernando de Soto, accounts of the vessels, the weather during the trip, and the domestic animals brought to North America. Students of Pánfilo de Narváez should be pleased with the chapter on his landing place and route, and, as the landing place of Narváez is essential to a study of the landfall of De Soto, this leads to an excellent chapter on the latter. The problem of De Soto's landing place has long interested Dr. Swanton and his findings and reasons for placing it on the southeast side of Tampa Bay on Terra Ceia Island are adequately summarized.

A large proportion of the book concerns the almost day by day account of the journey of the expedition, with exacting attention paid to the identification of each point along the route. The positions of certain of these points seem to be assured as reasonably as could be desired, others are established on relatively satisfactory grounds, while the rest are still in doubt, and probably will forever be so. Much valuable information is found in the appended material in the form of lists, tables, and maps. Among the lists is an extensive one of the participants in the expedition and the towns from which they came. A bibliography of 141 titles, a general index, and an index of modern geographical names in the United States help to make the book easily

consulted, as do the summaries to many of the chapters and the general summary at the end.

The reconstruction of the route of De Soto's expedition has been so thoroughly and painstakingly done in this report that a careful study of it must be made by those who consider it worth while to continue the spirited disputes that have long existed over the course taken by the conquistador and, after his death, by his successor, Moscoso. The entire report is a noteworthy contribution to the memory of the valiant leader of the first expedition of Europeans into the vast, forbidding Florida.

BARBARA BOSTON

Edward E. Ayer Collection,
The Newberry Library

## Contributors

*W. Eugene Shiels, S. J., Ph. D., is Assistant Professor of History at Loyola University, Chicago.*

*Barbara Boston, A. B., is Senior Assistant in the Edward E. Ayer Collection of the Newberry Library, Chicago.*

*Jean Delanglez, S. J., Ph. D., is a member of the Institute of Jesuit History, Loyola University, Chicago.*

# INDEX

## MID-AMERICA

### VOLUME XXI

INDEXER'S NOTE

*Names of contributors are in small capitals; titles of articles in this volume are in quotation marks; titles of books and periodicals reviewed or mentioned are in italics. Book reviews are entered under author and title of book, and under the name of the reviewer; no entries are made for subject of the book except in the case of biographies. The following abbreviations are used: tr., translator; ed., editor; revs., reviews, revd., reviewed. Clerical titles and titles of honor are found only when the forename is lacking.*


Abell, Father, 155
Accault, Michel, 39, 40, 44, 60, 64, 74, 80, 123, 234, 235
Acevedo, Antonio de, 156
Aco, see Accault
Aco, Peter, 123
Adams, Eleanor B., co-author, see Scholes, France V.
Aguirre, Andrés de, 115
Alabama, Catholic first things in, 110-12
Alegre, Francisco Javier, 27, 29, 30, 31, 259, 260
Allemany, Bishop, 141
Allemong, E., Julia Ann, 146
Allonne, Madeleine de Roybon d', 298-313
Allouez, Claude, 122, 123, 133, 160
Alman, Joseph, 153
Alpuentes, Juan, 144
Altamirano, Tomás, 26
Altham, John, 130
*America in Midpassage*, by C. A. Beard and M. R. Beard, revd., 324-25
*American Historical Review*, contents of noted, 241
Anastasius, Father. See Douay, Anastasius
Ange, H., Marie, Victoire, 154
Angeles, Theophilus de [Juan de Loyola], 108
Anunciación, Domingo de la, 111, 112, 119
Appoquinimink, Delaware, 118
Aquaviva, Claude, 258, 261
Aramipinchicone, Marie, 123
Aranz, Domingo de, 116
Arizona, Catholic first things in, 112-14
Arkansas, Catholic first things in, 114-15
Arkansas Indians, 64-65, 66, 114, 149
Arredondo, Antonio de, 284
Asunción, Juan de la, 112, 113
Atoka, Oklahoma, 149
Aubry [d'Aubri], Nicholas, 130
Augustinians, 100
Ayllon, Lucas Vásquez de, 145, 152
Badin, Stephen T., 123, 128, 148, 155
Baegert, Joseph, 108
Báez, Domingo Agustín, 120
Bagley, Clarence E., 160
Baillarjeon, Anthony, 137
Baillarjeon, Peter, 137
Bancroft, H. H., 112, 141
Bandelier, A. F., 112, 116, 125
BANNON, JOHN F., "The Conquest of the Chinipas," 3-31
Barbastro, Luis Cancer de, 119
Barber, Rev. Mr., 142
Barber, Virgil, 142
Barnes, Donald Grove, *George III and William Pitt, 1783-1806*, revd., 323-24
Barrientes, Pedro, 275
Barrière, Michael B., 128, 148
Baury, Louis, 132
Bautista, Don, 10
Beard, Charles A., and Beard, Mary R., *America in Midpassage*, revd., 324-25
Beard, Mary R., co-author, see Beard, Charles A.
Beau, Françoise le, 137
Beaubien, Jean Baptiste, 122, 123
Beaubien, Philip, 123
Bedford, New Hampshire, 142
Belcourt, George A., 153, 154
Bellevue, Nebraska, 140
Benavides, Martín, 31
Bernard, J. F., 296
Bernou, Claude, 45-47, 54, 57, 59, 67
Beteta, Gregorio de, 153
Beudin, Cornelio, 101
Beynroth, Charles E., 206
Biard, Father, 130
*Bibliographie der Moderne Devotie*,

contents of noted, 83
Biedma, Luis Hernández de, 277, 286
Bienville, Jean Baptiste Le Moyne, sieur de, 40, 215, 222
Bigot, Jacques, Vincent, 141
Billington, Ray Allen, *The Protestant Crusade, 1800-1860,* revd., 178-82
Blackfeet Indians, 139
Blanchet, Francis N., 150, 159, 160
Blayny, Ann, 143
Bledsoe, Albert Taylor, 202-03
Bobadilla, Diego, 102
Bolac, Francis, 158
Bolton, Herbert E., 159
Bonifaz, Alonzo de, 98, 274, 275
Bonifaz, Luis de, 101, 267
Bonnault, Claude de, 300, 301, 302, 303, 308
Bonnécamps, Joseph-Pierre de, 127, 162
Bonrepaus, François Dusson, sieur de, 78, 80
Bordenave, M., 135
Book reviewing, note on, 167-72
Boranga, Carl [Juan Bautista Pérez], 108
BOSTON, BARBARA, "The Route of De Soto: Delisle's Interpretation," 277-97; revs. *Final Report of the United States De Soto Expedition Commission,* 325-27
Boston, Massachusetts, 131
Bouchet, Francis, 154
Bourbonnet, Catherine, 125
Bourgmond, Etienne Véniard de, 126
Bourne, E. G., 284
Brazilian studies, development of noted, 315-17
Bretonnière, Jacques de la, 127
Brisacier, Jacques-Charles de, 235
Briset [Bruyas], Jacques, 117, 158, 235
Brown, Eleonorae, 128
Browne, Samuel, 163
Bruyas, see Briset
Bueras, Juan de, 101, 102, 269
Bureau, Jacques, 214-15
Burke, Edmund, 147, 186
Burke, Father, 145
Burlington, Vermont, 158
Burton, Esther, John, 118
Butler, Ruth Lapham, note on James A. Robertson, 314-15; on Brazilian studies, 315-17
Butler, Senator, 194-95
Cabrillo, Rodriguez, 115
Cadillac, Antoine de Lamothe, 133
Cadillac, Marie Thérèse, 133
Cairo, Illinois, 127
Calderón, Francisco, 271, 273
Calhoun, John C., 185, 189
California, Catholic first things in, 155
Callières, Louis Hector de, 311
Cambrelang, John, 152
Cameron, Charles Edward, 159
Campbell, John, 157
Campbell, Mary, Samuel, 131
Campo, Pedro, 119
Canadian Catholic Historical Association, *Report 1936-1937,* contents of noted, 85; *Report 1937-1938,* contents of noted, 241
*Canadian Historical Review,* contents of noted, 241
Capuchins, 131
Carillo, Fernando, 266
Carins, Guillermo, 101
Carmelites, 100
Carrafa, Vincent, 101, 102, 103, 104
Carroll, John, 153, 163
Carson City, Nevada, 141
Casin, Conly, Conleith Plunkett, 153
Casson, Dollier de, 142, 157, 158
Castañeda, Carlos E., 111, 112, 125, 128, 143
Castini, Pedro Juan, 11, note 11, 12-15
Catalogne, Gédéon de, 309
"Catholic First Things in the United States," by G. J. GARRAGHAN, 110-66
*Catholic Historical Review,* contents of noted, 241
Cavelier, Jean, 114, 149, 302, 303-04, 313
Céleron, Piérre-Joseph de, 127
Cermenho, Sebastián Rodriguez, 115
Cervantes, Antonio de, 158
Chambers, Jane Mullanphy, 128
Champigny, Jean Bochart de, 219
Champlain, Samuel de, 142
Charles III, King, 108
Charles V, King, 99
Charleston, North Carolina, 146
Charleston, South Carolina, 153
Chase, Salmon P., 194
Chassein, Agnes, 115
Chaumonot, Pierre Joseph, 144, 145
Cheoupingoua, Domitilla, 137
Cheyenne, Wyoming, 161
Cheverus, John, 130, 142
Chicago, Illinois, 122, 191; Common Council of, 191
Chichimecas Indians, 263
Chickasaw Indians, 73, 135
Chinipas, conquest of, 3-31
Chouteau, Antoine, 138
Chouteau, Ligueste, 127
*The Church in the Nineteenth Century,* publication of noted, 82
Ciquard, Francis, 130
Clay, Henry, 185, 189
Clery, Patrick, 145, 146
Cobameai, 16, 18
Coeur d'Alene Indians, 121
Coffee Run, Delaware, 118

Colan, Eliza, 146
*Collections*, Illinois State Historical Association, publication of noted, 243
Colorado, Catholic first things in, 116-17
*Colorado Magazine*, contents of noted, 242
Condamine, Matthew, 124
Conejos, Colorado, 117
*La Congregation de la mission des Lazaristes*, publication of noted, 83
Connecticut, Catholic first things in, 117-18
"The Conquest of the Chinipas," by J. F. BANNON, 3-13
Consag, Ferdinand, 108
Constitution, United States, 186, 191, 198
Contreras, Juan de, 153
Coosa, 111
Copart, Bautista, 27
Copley, Thomas, 159
Coquart, Gabriel, 138, 146, 153
Coronado expedition, 112, 113, 116, 125, 126, 135, 139, 143, 144, 148, 156
Corosia, 29, 31
*Correspondence de Ferdinand Verbiest de la Compagnie de Jésus, 1623-1688, directeur de l'Observatoire de Pékin*, publication of noted, 243-44
Cotterill, R. S., *A Short History of the Americas*, revd., 322-23
Couagne, Charles de, 309-10
Council Bluffs, Iowa, 125, 140
Council of the Indies, 101, 104, 105, 106, 107, 256, 263, 264, 265, 266, 272, 273, 276
COX, ISAAC J., revs. Delanglez' *Some La Salle Journeys*, 174-75
Coxe, David, 77
Crespe, Francisco, 268
"The Critical Period in Mission History," by W. E. SHIELS, 97-109
Croix, Charles de la, 126, 127, 136, 138
Cross, Marion E. (tr.), *Father Louis Hennepin's Description of Louisiana*, revd., 88-89
Croyère, Louis de la, 282
Cruz, Juan de la, 113
Cunningham, John, Elizabeth, Andrew, 142
Curtin, Jeremiah, life of noted, 239-40
Cuteco, 29
Dablon, Claude, 144, 145
Daillon, Joseph de la Roche, 144
D'Allonne, Madeleine de Roybon, 298-313
Davion, Antoine, 112, 122, 134, 135, 136, 137, 216, 228
Davis, Jefferson, 196
De Lacy, Michael, 145, 146
De Michel, 42
De Smet, Peter J., 120, 125, 138, 140, 153, 154, 157, 161, 162
De Soto, Hernando, 111, 114, 119, 128, 129, 134, 135, 145, 146, 148, 152, 154, 155, 156, 160, 277-97
DELANGLEZ, JEAN, "Hennepin's Voyage to the Gulf of Mexico, 1860," 32-81; "Mlle. De Roybon D'Allonne; La Salle's Fiancée?" 298-313; (ed.) "Tonti Letters," 209-38; revs. Roy's *La Famille de Rigaud de Vaudreuil*, 177-78; Roy's *Rapport de l'Archiviste de la Province de Québec pour 1937-1938*, 246-47; his *Some La Salle Journeys*, revd., 174-75
Delaware, Catholic first things in, 118-19
Delhalle, Constantine, 133
Delisle, Claude, 210, 212, 213, 214, 215, 282, 287
Deslisle, Guillaume, interpretation of De Soto's route, 277-97
Deslisle, Joseph Nicholas, 282, 283, 289
Demers, Modeste, 139, 159, 160
*Democratic Review*, on higher law doctrine, 191-92
Denonville, Jacques-René de Brisay, marquis de, 219, 222, 306, 307
Denver, Colorado, 117
Deschamps, Jean Baptiste, Marie, 137
*Description of Louisiana*, Hennepin's, 32, 38, 40, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 66, 67, 69, 70, 73, 75, 76
Detroit, Michigan, 133
Devernes, Margaret, 153
Dickson, William, Louise, 154
Didier, Pierre Joseph, 147
Digges, Thomas, 163
District of Columbia, Catholic first things in, 163
Dobrizhoffer, Martin, 100
Dollier de Casson, François, 142, 157, 158
Dominguez, Atanasio, 157
Dominicans, 100, 111, 119, 145, 152-53, 158, 258
*Don Diego Quijada, Alcalde Mayor de Yucatan, 1561-1565*, by F. V. Scholes and E. B. Adams, revd., 247-49
Dongan, Thomas, 307, 308
Dongé, Pierre, 111
Donoghue, David, 125
Donohue, Father, 149, 150
Douay, Anastasius, 40, 42, 43, 50, 114, 149
Douglas, Stephen A., 191, 201

Dover, Delaware, 118
Doyle, John Edward, 117
Druillettes, Gabriel, 117, 130, 131
Du Pénet, M., 127
Du Ru, Paul, 55, 129, 135
Dubos, J. B., 58
Dubuque, Iowa, 124
Dufresne, Nicolas Jenvrin, 309
Dugué [Auguelle], Pierre, 39, 40, 44, 60, 61, 64, 74, 234, 235
Duluth, Daniel Greysolon, sieur, 80, 124, 133, 234
Dumoulin, Severe, 147, 153
Dunand, Joseph, 161
DUNNE, PETER M., revs. Cotterill's *A Short History of the Americas*, 322-23
Durbin, Father, 155
Durham, New Hampshire, 141
*The Early Dominicans: Studies in Thirteenth-Century Dominican History*, publication of noted, 83
*The Early Writings of Frederick Jackson Turner*, by E. E. Edwards (comp.), revd. 89-90
Eckbet, George, 117
Edwards, Everett E. (comp.), *The Early Writings of Frederick Jackson Turner*, revd., 89-90
Edwards, Father, 159
Elvas, Gentleman of, 277, 278, 284, 286-89, 291, 292, 293
England, Bishop, 146, 153
*The Enigma of James II*, by M. V. Hay, revd., 320-22
Escalante, Silvestre Vélez de, 157
Escañuelas, Bishop, 30
Espiritu Santo Bay, 279, 283, 286, 288, 291, 292, 294, 295, 296
Essex, Thomas, 206-08
Faherty, W. B., note on historical painting, 317-19
Faille, Alexis, 138
Fairbanks, G. R., 285
*La Famille de Rigaud de Vaudreuil*, by P. G. Roy, revd., 177-78
Farmer, Ferdinand, 118, 144, 145
*Father Louis Hennepin's Description of Louisiana*, by M. E. Cross (tr.), revd., 88-89
Fayetteville, North Carolina, 145
Fenwick, Edward, 148
*Final Report of the United States De Soto Expedition Commission*, revd., 325-27
"The First Bookstore in Saint Louis," by J. F. MCDERMOTT, 206-08
*First Establishment of the Faith*, 37-38, 47, 51, 56, 57
Flathead Indians, 121, 138-39, 162
*Flight Into Oblivion*, publication of noted, 82
Florida, Catholic first things in, 119
Florissant, Missouri, 126, 136
Foley, James P., 157
Fontenelle, Logan, Emilie, 140
Foreign Missions, ecclesiastics of the, 216, 219, 222, 235
Foronda, Juan Ortiz de, 23
Fort Colville, Washington, 160
Fort Laramie, Wyoming, 162
Fort Prudhomme, 49-50
Fort Ste. Anne, Vermont, 158
Fort Vancouver, Washington, 160
Foucault, Nicolas, 114, 115
Franciscans, 97, 100, 113, 116, 119, 156, 258
Frankfort, Kentucky, 128
Franquelin, Jean-Baptiste-Louis, 57
Frasier, Joseph, Maria Louise, 124
Frémin, Jacques, 158
French, B. F., 296
French, Elizabeth, 163
French, Father, 142
Frensley, Emilia, 156
Frias, A., death of noted, 244
*From Many Centuries*, publication of noted, 243
Frontenac, Louis de Buade, Comte de Palluau et de, 38, 67, 79, 300, 302
Fugitive Slave Law, 186, 191, 192, 193, 194, 198, 200, 201, 204
Galena, Illinois, 124
Gallagher, Joseph, 141
Gallipolis, Ohio, 147, 148
Garcés, Francisco, 141
García, Juan, 119
García, María Nicolasa, 117
Garcilaso de la Vega, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 286, 289, 290, 292
Gardner, Anne, 131-32
GARRAGHAN, GILBERT J., "Catholic First Things in the United States," 110-66; his *The Jesuits of the Middle United States*, revd., 86-87
Garvin, John, Susanna Elizabeth, 156
Gaston, Mrs., 146
*A General History of the United States since 1865*, by G. F. Howe, revd., 245
Genoa, Nevada, 141
Geoghan, Father, 143
*George III and William Pitt, 1783-1806*, by D. G. Barnes, revd., 323-24
Georgetown, D. C., 163
Georgetown College, 163
Georgia, Catholic first things in, 119-20
Gervaise, Thomas, 130
*Geschichte der böhmischen Provinz der Gesellchaft Jesu*, publication of noted, 83
Gibbons, Edward, 131
Giddings, Joshua, 192
Gildea, J., 162

Gilpin, John, 120
Glandorf, Hermann, 108
Gomar, Antonio, 31
Gómez, Marcos, 18
Gonnor, Nicholas de, 133
González, Bartolomé, 274
González de Cuenca y Contreras, Diego, 265
Gordon, John, 117
Gorman, James, John, Mary, 162
Gosselin, Amédée, 236
Gouffrane, James, Elizabeth, 152
Goyens, Jérôme, 34, 35, 36, 40, 69, 71, 72, 75, 76
Gravier, Father, 40-41, 42, 43, 129
Gravier, Jacques, 114
Greaton, Joseph, 151
Griffin, Martin I., 142
Groseilliers, Médard Chouart, sieur de, 133, 160, 161
Guadalcazar, Marqués de, 261
Guale Island, Georgia, 120
Guazápari Indians, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19, 27-28
Guignas, Michel, 133
Guilday, P., 159
Guion, Marie Thérèse, 133
Gust, Henry, Mary Magdalen, Rosina, 151
Guttiérez, Andrés, 113
Guyenne, Alexis-Xavier de, 123
Guzmán, Diego de, 10, 13
Hakluyt, Richard, 285
Hale, Senator, 192
Hallahan [Holohan], Cornelius, 118
Holliday, Mary, 118
Hanrahan, Mr., 145
Harper's Ferry, West Virginia, 162
Harris, W. R., 157
Harrisse, H., 145, 158, 214
Hartford, Connecticut, 117
Harvey, Thomas, 117, 142, 150, 151
Haug, Christian, 143
Hautmesnil, Jean Vincent Philippe de, 309
Hay, Malcolm V., *The Enigma of James II*, revd., 320-22
Hempsted, Stephen, Caroline, 161
Hennepin, Louis, 123, 124, 133, 134, 234; voyage of to Gulf of Mexico in 1860, 32-81
"Hennepin's Voyage to the Gulf of Mexico 1860," by J. DELANGLEZ, 32-81
"The Higher Law Controversy," by F. E. WELFLE, 185-205
Hispanic America, critical period in mission history of, 97-109; legal crisis in Jesuit missions of, 253-76
*Hispanic American Historical Review*, contents of noted, 242
*Histoire de la congrégation de Saint-Maur*, publication of seventh volume noted, 83
Hoecken, Christian, 140, 147, 154
Hoerner, James, 162
Hopi Indians, 113
Hosmer, William, on the higher law, 187-89; on slavery, 197-99
Houck, Louis, 126, 135
Howe, George Frederick, *A General History of the United States since 1865*, revd., 245
Huite Indians, 6-7, 10
Hunter, Mr., on higher law, 190
Hurdaide, Diego Martínez de, 4, 6, 10, 15
Husarone Indians, 28
Hutchinson, William T. (ed.), *The Marcus W. Jernegan Essays in American Historiography*, revd., 91-93
Hutter, Juan de, 101
Iberville, Pierre Le Moyne, sieur d', 40, 53, 57, 58, 135, 213, 217, 219, 220-22, 223, 235, 293, 294
Idaho, Catholic first things in, 120-21
Illinois, Catholic first things in, 121-23
Illinois River, Hennepin's descent of, 44-47
Indian Hill, New York, 145
Indiana, Catholic first things in, 123-24
Indians of New Spain, missions among, 257-64, 274
Iowa, Catholic first things in, 124-25
Iroquois Indians, 138, 306, 308, 311
JACOBSEN, JEROME V., Editor, notes and comment; revs. Garraghan's *The Jesuits of the Middle United States*, 86-87; Scholes and Adams' *Don Diego Quijada, Alcalde Mayor de Yucatan, 1561-1565*, 247-49
Jaillot, Alexis Hubert, 280, 281
James, James, Ann, William, 163
Jerocavi, 28, 29
Jesuit missions of Hispanic America, 97-109, 253-76
Jesuit plantations, article on noted, 240
*Les Jésuites*, translation of noted, 83
Jesuits, 40-41, 79, 97-98, 99, 100-09, 120, 132, 137, 138, 145, 218, 221, 233, 235
*The Jesuits of the Middle United States*, by G. J. Garraghan, revd., 86-87
Jiménez, Francisco, 23
Joaltona, Pedro, 113
Jogues, St. Isaac, 132, 144
Joinville, Gabriel de, 130
Jolliet, Louis, 66-68, 80
*Journal of Mississippi History*, first number of noted, 240
*Journal of Politics*, first number of noted, 240
*Journal of Southern History*, con-

tents of noted, 242
*Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society*, contents of noted, 84
Jousset, Suzanne, 310
Joutel, Henri, 43, 59
Juillet, Father, 142
Kalispel Indians, 139
KANE, W., revs. Hay's *The Enigma of James II*, 320-22
Kansas, Catholic first things in, 125-27
Kansas City, Missouri, 137
*Kansas Historical Quarterly*, contents of noted, 85
Kansas-Nebraska Act, 194, 210, 204
Kaskaskia Indians, 136
Kaw Indians, 126
Kearney, Nicholas, 145, 146
Keer, P., 278, 279
Kellogg, Louise P., 212
Kelly, Edward, 157
Kelly, William, 161, 162
Kenny, Michael, 158, 159
Kentucky, Catholic first things in, 127-28
Keokuk, Iowa, 124
Killan, William, Mary, John Thomas, 163
King, Grace, 284
KINIERY, PAUL, revs. Edwards' (comp.) *The Early Writings of Frederick Jackson Turner*, 89-90; Howe's *A General History of the United States since 1865*, 245; Kohlmeier's *The Old Northwest as the Keystone of the Arch of American Federal Union*, 90-91
Kino, Eusebio, 108, 109, 113
Knappen, M. M., *Tudor Puritanism*, revd., 175-77
Knoxville, Tennessee, 155
Kohl, George, Barbara, Albertina, 151
Kohlmeier, A. L., *The Old Northwest as the Keystone of the Arch of American Federal Union*, revd., 90-91
Koroa Indians, 51-53, 63, 134
Krebbs, John M., 199
La Barre, Joseph-Antoine Lefebvre de, 305
La Forest, sieur de [François Daupin], 219, 222, 302
La Framboise, Josette, 123
La Junta, Texas, 156
La Salle, Robert Cavelier, sieur de, 32, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 45-46, 49, 50, 54, 56, 57, 59, 60, 67, 76, 77, 114, 123, 129, 134, 149, 155, 222, 223, 228, 234, 298-313
La Salle's fiancée, 298-313
La Source, Mme. 312
La Verendrye expedition, 146
Laet, Jean de, 279, 280, 285, 287
Lagunilla, Balthasar de, 268
Lahontan, Louis-Armand de Lom d'Arce, baron de, 50
Lamberville, Jean de, 306-07
LANGFORD, WALTER M., revs. Murdock's *The Sun at Noon*, 245-46
Langlois, Antoine, 150
L'Archevesque, 42
Larios, Juan de, 156, 157
*Latin America*, publication of noted, 243
Latouche, 217
Laurent, Father, 115
Laval, Bishop, 235
Le Boullenger, Jean Baptiste, 155
Le Chibelier, Catherine, 129
Le Clercq, Chrestien, 33, 37, 38, 39, 43, 47, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 68, 69, 71, 76, 79
Le Mercier, François, 120, 145
Le Moyne, Simon, 145
Le Sueur, Pierre-Charles, 218, 222
Lefebre, Louise, 161
"The Legal Crisis in the Jesuit Missions of Hispanic America," by W. E. SHIELS, 253-76
Legrand, Pacôme, 123
Leland, W. G., 212
Lemay, Hugolin, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43
Leónard, Father, 210-12, 213, 214, 215
Leopold, Emperor, 108
Leroux, Valentin, 37, 38, 39, 52, 59, 79
Lewis, T. H., 148, 284
*Life and Work of Mother Benedicta Bauer*, publication of noted, 83
*The Life of Venerable Francis Libermann*, publication of noted, 83
Lincoln, Abraham, 195
Lobera, Gerónimo de, 106
Longueil, Thomas, Catherine, Margaret, 158
López, Francisco, 143
López, Nicholas, 156
Lord, John C., 199-200
Lorentz, Maurice, 143
Loreto, 26-27
Louis XIV, King, 79-80
Louisiana, Catholic first things in, 128-29
Louisville, Kentucky, 128
Lowery, Woodbury, 111, 119, 152, 285
Luna, Tristán de, 111
Lutz, Joseph Anthony, 126, 137
MCAULIFFE, H. J., revs. Cross's (tr.) *Father Louis Hennepin's Description of Louisiana*, 88-89
MCDERMOTT, JOHN FRANCIS, "The First Bookstore in St. Louis," 206-08
McDonald, Mary, 146

McGrath, Bridget, 157
McLaughlin, Andrew James, Mary, Patrick, 145
McNamara, Robert, 146
McWillie, Senator, 197
Mack, Effie, 141
"Mlle. De Roybon D'Allonne: La Salle's Fiancée?" J. DELANGLEZ, 298-313
Maginnis, John, 146
Magudiens, Patrick, Mary, Catherine, 118
Mainard, Antoine, 132
Mainard, Maurice, 133
Maine, Catholic first things in, 130
Mair, David, Lawrence, 143
MaKarmick, Elias, Patrick, 143
Mancher, Andreas [Alfonso de Castro], 108
*The Marcus W. Jernegan Essays in American Historiography*, by W. T. Hutchinson (ed.), revd. 91-93
Marest, Gabriel, 136
Margry, Pierre, 66, 303, 313
Marquette, Jacques, 47, 114, 121, 122, 123, 124, 127, 132, 135, 155
Martin, Andrés, 114
Martin, Pedro, 111
Martínez, Manuel, 17-18
Martínez, Pedro, 119
Martinsburg, West Virginia, 162
Maryland, Catholic first things in, 130-31
Massachusetts, Catholic first things in, 131-32
Massicotte, E. Z., 309, 310
Mataouiska, Claude, 130
Matignon, Francis A., 118, 142, 158
Maurepas, Comte de [Jérôme Phélypeaux], 217
Maynard, Theodore, 284
Mazuelas, Juan de, 111
Mazzuchelli, Samuel, 124
*Medical Alumni Quarterly*, contents of noted, 242
Mellen, Fernando de, 269
Membré, Zenobe, 37, 59, 134, 155
Memphis, Tennessee, 155
Ménard, René, 132, 160, 161
Méndez, Pedro, 4
Mercator, G., 278, 279
Mercier, Jean Baptiste, 126, 136
Mermet, Jean, 122, 127
MERRILL, ETHEL OWEN, revs. Scanlan's *Prairie du Chien: French, British, American*, 87-88
Merrill, William S., note on Jeremiah Curtin, 239
METZGER, CHARLES H., revs. Barnes's *George III and William Pitt, 1783-1806*, 323-24; Hutchinson's (ed.) *The Marcus W. Jernegan Essays in American Historiography*, 91-93; Knappen's *Tudor Puritanism*, 175-77
Meurin, Sebastian Louis, 123, 124, 137
Mexico, Jesuit missions in, 100-09
Michaud, Jean, 305-06
Michigan, Catholic first things in, 132-33
*Michigan History Magazine*, contents of noted, 85
Mieje, J. B., 117
Miles, Bishop, 155
Milet, Pierre, 308, 309
Minet, 57
Minguez, Juan, 116, 126, 139, 140
Minnesota, Catholic first things in, 133-34
Mission history, critical period in, 97-109
Mississippi, Catholic first things in, 134-35
Mississippi River, Hennepin's voyage down, 32-81; Tonti's description of, 212-13
Missouri, Catholic first things in, 135-38
*Missouri Historical Review*, contents of noted, 84
Monaghan, John, 149, 150
Monesir, Edward de, 163
Monette, J. W., 285
Mongrain, Henri, 127
Monroy, Diego de, 105, 106, 274
Montagne, Antoine, Felix Joseph, Marie, 153
Montana, Catholic first things in, 138-39
Montcharvaux, François Tiseran de, Elizabeth Tiseran de, 115
Montefrio, Egidio de, 101
Monterey, California, 115
Monterrey, Conde de, 4
Montesinos, Antonio de, 158, 159
Montigny, François Jolliet de, 122, 129, 134, 135, 136, 137, 211, 212, 216, 227, 235
Montmorency, Florian de, 103
Moriceau, Louis, 310
Moscoso, Luis, 128, 156
Motilinia, 112
Moya de Contreras, Pedro, 259
Mullanphy, John, 128
Mullen, Bridget, 157
Muñoz, Francisco, 116
Murdock, Kenneth B., *The Sun at Noon*, revd., 245-46
Narváez, Pánfilo de, 119, 156
Nashville, Tennessee, 155, 156
Natchez Indians, 134, 135
Natchitoches, Louisiana, 149
Neale, Francis, 163
Nebraska, Catholic first things in, 139-40
Nerinckx, Charles, 128
Neofrito, Mary, 146

Neumann, Joseph, 108
Nevada, Catholic first things in, 140-41
*New Discovery*, Hennepin's, 32, 33, 38, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 53, 59, 62, 64-65, 66, 67, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 81
New Hampshire, Catholic first things in, 141-42
New Haven, Connecticut, 117
New Jersey, Catholic first things in, 142-43
New Mexico, Catholic first things in, 143-44
New Orleans, Louisiana, 129
New Spain, missions in, 98-109
*New Voyage*, Hennepin's, 32, 33, 42, 50, 51, 56, 58, 59, 69, 70, 77
New York, Catholic first things in, 144-45
New York City, 144
Newark, New Jersey, 143
Newbern, North Carolina, 145, 146
Newport, Rhode Island, 152
Nickel, Goswin, 98, 104, 106, 269, 270, 271, 272-74, 276
Niza, Marcos de, 112, 113, 143, 144
North Carolina, Catholic first things in, 145-46
North Dakota, Catholic first things in, 146-47
North Platte, Nebraska, 140
Norfolk, Virginia, 159
Nouvel, Henri, 133
Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe, 26
Nuestra Señora de Valleumbroso, 26
Nye, Senator, 192-93
O'Callaghan, Jeremiah, 158
O'Cavanaugh, Bernard, 117
O'Connor, Thomas, 144
Odin, Father, 149
O'Donoghue, Father, 145
O'Gallagher, O. F., 153
Ohio, Catholic first things in, 147-48
Oklahoma, Catholic first things in, 148-50
*The Old Northwest as the Keystone of the Arch of American Federal Union*, by A. L. Kohlmeier, revd., 90-91
OLIPHANT, J. ORIN, revs. Billington's *The Protestant Crusade*, 178-82
Oliva, John Paul, 107, 108
Olivera, Juan Fernández de, 285
Oñate, Juan de, 115, 148, 149
Onondaga mission, New York, 144
Oregon, Catholic first things in, 150
Ordaz, Manual, 31
Ortega, José Pablo, María de la Luz, 117
Ortelius, A., 278
Orvilliers, Remy de Guilloust, sieur d', 306
Oviedo y Valdés, Gonzalo Fernández de, 277-78
*Pacific Northwest Quarterly*, contents of noted, 84
Padilla, Juan de, 113, 116, 125, 126, 127, 139, 140, 143, 144, 148, 149, 156
Palafox, Juan de, 266, 267, 269-70
Palladino, L., 146
Paltsits, V. H., 33-34
*Papers in Illinois History*, publication of noted, 84
Pardow, Gregory, 142
Parker, Theodore, 197, 199, 200
Parkman, Francis, 35, 300, 302, 303, 313
Paraguay, 274, 275, 276
Parrón, Fernando, 115
Partius, Marguerite, 137
Pascual, José, 269
Pascual, Julio, 14-18
Pastells, Pablo, 100
Pastor, Juan, 100
Pawnee Indians, 139
Pawtucket, Rhode Island, 152
Pécoro, Fernando, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28
Pedreza, Julian de, 274
Pelleprat, Pierre, 98, 99
Pembina, North Dakota, 147
Penaranda, Count of, 105, 106
Pend d'Oreille Indians, 121, 138-39, 162
Pennsylvania, Catholic first things in, 150-51
Peoria, Illinois, 123
Percall, Joseph, Sara, 128
Perea, Estevan de, 116, 117
Perea, Joseph de Torres, 114
Perea, Pedro de, 15, 19
Perier, Catherine de, 129
Perier, Etienne de, 129
Perrot, Nicolas, 209
Peru, 286
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 151
Philip II, King, 99, 254, 258
Philip III, King, 261, 263
Philip IV, King, 99, 107
Philip V, King, 109
Piccolomini, Francisco, 269
Pichardo, Father, 126
Pierce, Chaterine, 163
Pierron, Jean, 118, 158
Pierson, Philippe, 124, 133
Pinckney, Charles, 194
Pinet, Pierre-François, 122, 136
Pino, Juan del, 116
Pion, Marie, 137
Pius V, Pope, 258
Plaza, Juan de la, 259
Plet, François, 298
Pliego, Conde de, 265
Plunkett, Robert, 163
Point, Nicholas, 121, 139

Poitiers, Robert du, 143
Ponce de León, 119
Pontchartrain, Louis Phélypeaux, Comte de, 78, 80, 214
Ponziglione, P. M., 149-50
Poole, W. F., 59
Porras, Francisco de, 113
Portsmouth, New Hampshire, 141, 142
Poterie, Claude Florent Bouchard de la, 131, 152
Prado, Nicolas de, 23, 24, 25, 27, 31
*Prairie du Chien: French, British, American,* by P. L. Scanlan, revd., 87-88
Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin, 161; pictorial history of noted, 317-19
Priat, Yves, 310
Price, Margaret, 132
*Private Libraries in Creole Saint Louis,* publication of noted, 82
*The Protestant Crusade, 1800-1860: A Study of the Origins of American Nativism,* by R. A. Billington, revd., 178-82
Providence, Rhode Island, 152
*Quarterly Journal of Inter-American Relations,* first number of noted, 240
Quinipissa Indians, 53, 61, 63
Quiros, Luis de, 159
Quivira expedition, 125, 126, 148
Rada, Andrés de, 103, 104, 270, 271, 274
Radisson, Pierre Esprit, 160, 161
Radisson, Etienne de, 312
Rale, Sebastian, 141
Raleigh, North Carolina, 145
Rangel, Rodrigo, 277, 283, 284, 286, 297
Raphael, Father, 129
*Rapport de l'Archiviste de la Province de Québec pour 1937-1938,* by P. G. Roy, revd., 246-47
Raudot, Jacques, 310, 312
Raverdy, J. B., 157
Ravoux, A., 154
Raymbaut, Charles, 132
Real, Juan de la, 106, 273-74, 275
Recollects, 52, 79, 131, 132, 157
Redmond, Father, 161
*A Reference Guide to the Literature of Travel,* publication of noted, 243
Renaudot, Eusèbe, 67, 214
Reviewing books, note on, 167-72
Rhode Island, Catholic first things in, 151-52
Rhodes, J. F., 185, 187, 201
Rian, Nicholas J., 148
Ribas, Pérez de, 17, 18, 19, 100, 266
Ribourde, Gabriel de la, 123
Richard, Gabriel, 122
Richardie, Armand de la, 147, 148
Rigbie, Roger, 159
Rio, Marcos del, 101
Rivas, Pérez de, 266
Robertson, James Alexander, death of noted, 244, 314-15
Robin, Abbé, 117
Robot, Isidore, 149
Rochambeau, Jean Baptiste Donatien, Comte de, 117
Roche, James, 142
Rochefort, César de, 289, 290, 294, 296
Rogel, Juan, 153
Rohan, William de, 155
Rolof, Francis, 162, 163
*Romantic Review,* contents of noted, 242
Romero, Bartolomé, 116
Ronde, Sieur de la [Louis Denys], 222
Rosseter, John, 118
"The Route of De Soto: Delisle's Interpretation," by B. BOSTON, 277-97
Roux, Benedict, 137, 138
Roy, Martha, 138
Roy, Pierre-Georges, *La Famille de Rigaud de Vaudreuil,* revd., 177-78; *Rapport de l'Archiviste de la Province de Québec pour 1937-1938,* revd., 246-47
Roybon. See Allonne
Rupell, Harrett, 153
Ryan, Daniel, Edward, 157
Ryan, Father, 153
Rye, W. B., 285
St. Clement's Isle, Maryland, 130
Saint-Cosme, Jean-François Buisson de, 122, 134, 136, 137, 211, 212, 216, 232
Saint Croix Island, Maine, 130
St. Cyr, Irenaeus Mary, 122
Sainte Genevieve, Missouri, 137
St. Ignace, Michigan, 132
St. Louis, Missouri, 136, 137; first bookstore in, 206-08
St. Paul-on-the-Willamette, Oregon, 150
St. Pierre, Paul de, 128
Saint-Vallier, Jean Baptiste de la Croix de Chevrières de, 235, 236
Salazar, Diego de, 104, 270
Salazar, Domingo de, 111
Salisbury, North Carolina, 146
Salt Lake City, Utah, 157
Salvatierra, Conde de, 269
Salvatierra, Juan María, 23, 27-31, 108, 113
San Diego, Alonso de, 144
San Diego, California, 115
San Francisco Javier de Babuyagui, 21-22
San Luis de la Paz, 263
San Ysidro, Texas, 156

Sánchez, Manuel, 23
Sandusky, Ohio, 147, 148
Sangro, Carlos de, 101, 102, 269
Sanson, Nicolas, 280
Santa Cruz de Nanipacna, 111
Santa Elena, South Carolina, 153
Santa Inés de Chinipas, 25, 26
Santa Magdalena de Témoris, 26
Santa Teresa de Guazáparis, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31
Sauer, Carl, 112
Sault Ste Marie, 132
Scanlan, Peter Lawrence, *Prairie du Chien: French, British, American*, revd., 87-88
Schlarman, John H., 137
Schneider, Joseph, 151
Schneider, Theodore, 142, 143
Scholes, France V., and Adams, Eleanor B., *Don Diego Quijada, Alcalde Mayor de Yucatan, 1561-1565*, revd., 247-49
Scott, Aquila, 120
Scott, H. A., 34, 71
Scott, Ignatius, 120
Sedeño, Antonio, 120
Segura, Juan B., 159
Seignelay, Jean Baptiste Colbert, marquis de, 304
Seminario de San Martin, 260
Semmes, Henrietta, 120
Semmes, Mary, 120
Seneca Indians, 306, 307
Serra, Junípero, 115
Seward, William H., 185-95
Shea, John Gilmary, 32, 33, 35, 74-75, 119, 142, 144, 158, 212, 284
SHIELS, W. EUGENE, "The Critical Period in Mission History," 97-109; "The Legal Crisis in the Jesuit Missions of Hispanic America," 253-76; revs. Beard and Beard's *America in Midpassage*, 324-25
Shine, Michael, 126, 139
*A Short History of the Americas*, by R. S. Cotterill, revd., 322-23
Siedenburg, Frederic, death of noted, 172-73
Sierra, Alvaro Flores de la, 20-21
Sinaloa Indians, 4-6, 14, 19
Slavery and the higher law doctrine, 185-205
Smith, Jerrit, 205
Society of Foreign Missions, 112
Solorzano, Manuel, 23
*Some La Salle Journeys*, by J. Delanglez, revd., 174-75
Somerset, Ohio, 148
South Carolina, Catholic first things in, 152-53
South Dakota, Catholic first things in, 153-54
*Southern Press*, on higher law doctrine, 190
Spada, Cardinal, 81
Spain, colonial policy of, 253-76
Spalding, Martin J., 128, 155
Spanish colonies, attitude in toward mission activities, 98-109
Speed, J., 278, 279
Starkey, Lawrence, 159
Steel, Eliza, 146
Stokes, Joseph, 155
Stringfellow, Thornton, 201-02
Strobach, August [Carlos Xavier Calvanese de Calva], 108
Suárez, Juan, 156
Sumner, Charles, 193-94, 203
*The Sun at Noon*, by K. B. Murdock, revd., 245-46
Surgères, François de La Rochefoucauld, marquis de, 234
Swanton, John R., 285-86, 297
Sykes, Mary, 118
Taensa Indians, 51, 64, 73, 129
Talbot, John, 151
Tapia, José de, 21-22, 24
Tarahumara Indians, 20, 29, 30-31
Tatham, John, 142
Tennessee, Catholic first things in, 154-56
Tepeguan Indians, 263
Tepotzotlán, 259-62, 275
Texas, Catholic first things in, 156-57
Thaumur de la Source, 211
Thayer, Father, 128
Thayer, John, 152
Thomas, Arthur B., 140
Thompson, Mr., 162
Thornton, Margaret, 117
Thouret, 298, 301, 304
Thoynard, Nicholas, 57-58
Thury, Louis P., 141
Thwaites, Reuben Gold, 32, 33
Tiberge, Louis, 235
Tiguas Indians, 143
Tilpe, Johannes [Luis Turcotti], 108
Toctomoic, Catharina, 113
Toledo, Francisco de, 258
Tonti, Alphonse de, letters of Henry to, 215-35
Tonti [Tonty], Henry de, 39, 40, 43, 50, 80; letters of, 209-38
"Tonti Letters," edited by J. DELANGLEZ, 209-38
Torices, Francisco, 19
*Transactions of the Illinois State Historical Society*, changes in format noted, 84
Trecy, Jeremiah F., 140
Tremblay, Jean Henri, 235
Tremori Indians, 13, 14, 27-28
Trenton, New Jersey, 143
Trinidad, Colorado, 116
Tubare Indians, 30
*Tudor Puritanism*, by M. M. Knap-

pen, revd., 175-77
Tunica Indians, 134, 135
Twitchell, R. E., 140
Ulibarri, Juan de, 116
United States De Soto Expedition Commission, report of, 277, 286, 297, 325-27
Urdaneta, Andrés de, 115
Utah, Catholic first things in, 157
Utzman, John, 151
Vaca, Cabeza de, 156
Vaillant de Gueslis, François, 307, 308
Valverde, Antonio de, 116
Van Blocklandt, Mÿnheer, 49
Van Quickenborne, Charles F., 124, 125, 127, 149
Varela, Juan, 19
Varohio Indians, 16, 17-18, 19, 25
Vega, see Garcilaso de la Vega
Velasco, Francisco de, 126, 127, 149
Velasco, Fray de, 115
Velasco, López de, 286
Velasco, Luis de, II, 260
Velasco, Pedro de, 101, 262
Vermilion, South Dakota, 154
Vermont, Catholic first things in, 157-58
Vigil, José Miguel, 117
Vilier, Sieur de, 141, 142
Villada, Z. García, death of noted, 244
Villalta, Cristóbal de, 6-7, 10
Villasur, Pedro de, 116, 126
Villermont, Cabart de, 213, 214
Villiers, Marc de, 45
Vincennes, Indiana, 123, 124
Vintimille, 222
Virginia, Catholic first things in, 158-59
Viret, Louis, 162
Virot, Claude-François Louis, 127
Vitelleschi, Mutius, 100, 101, 102, 262, 264, 266, 267, 268, 269, 271, 273
Vitry, Pierre, 149
Walsh, Father, 149, 150
Walsh, Mary, William, 141
Washington, Catholic first things in, 159-60
Washington, North Carolina, 145, 146
*Washington Republic,* and higher law doctrine, 190-91
Watrin, François Philibert, 137
Webb, Thomas, 163
Webster, Daniel, 185, 189-90
WELFLE, FREDERICK E., "The Higher Law Controversy," 185-205
West Virginia, Catholic first things in, 162-63
Wheeling, West Virginia, 162, 163
Whelan, Bridget, 162
Whelan, Charles, 118, 128, 144
Whelan, James, 162
White, Andrew, 130-31
White Sulphur, Kentucky, 128
*Wider Horizons of American History,* publication of noted, 243
William III, King, 40, 42, 77, 79, 81
Wilmer, L. A., 285
Wisconsin, Catholic first things in, 160-61
*Wisconsin Magazine of History,* contents of noted, 85
Wise, Robertus, N., 128
Woodley, Robert D., 152
Wyoming, Catholic first things in, 161-62
Yank, Mary, 117
Yecarome Indians, 20
Young, Notley, 163
Zapata, Juan Ortiz, 26, 27
Zappa, Juan Bautista, 23
Zavaleta, Juan de, 156